DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 789 SP 028 947

AUTHOR Gress, James R., Ed.
TITLE Incentives for Excellence: Agendas and Arenas.
INSTITUTION Toledo Univ., Ohio. Coll. of Education and Allied Professions.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 112p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Ladders; Elementary Secondary Education; *Incentives; *Instructional Development; Merit Pay; *Professional Development; Public Opinion; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Recruitment; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Excellence in Education

ABSTRACT

The articles in this monograph focus on issues identified during participation in the U.S. Department of Education 1984 Teacher Incentive Structures Program, and the 1986 Project to Design Teacher Incentive Structures. Emphasis was on designing or adapting incentive structures for possible use in the school, community, or university. The following articles are presented: (1) "A Profession under Siege: Teacher Recruitment and Certification" (James R. Johnson and Mary Jo Henning); (2) "A Comprehensive Teacher Education Recruitment Plan" (Ruth King); (3) "Types of Incentives" (Jon Schaffarzick); (4) "The Toledo Plan" (Terry Wyatt and Eileen Burch); (5) "Tennessee's Career Ladder for Teachers" (Barbara G. Burch); (6) "A Locally Developed Career Ladder" (Ralph J. Haws and L. Ray Brown); (7) "Using Professional Development Centers and Career Ladders to Redesign the Teaching Profession" (Roy A. Edelfelt); (8) "Teacher Self-Evaluation: A Model for a Professional Approach to Instructional Improvement" (Robert L. Scholl); (9) "Non-Monetary Incentives" (James J. Cellio and Claire L. Jacobi); (10) "Community Perspective on Teacher Incentives" (James R. Gress); and (11) "Excellence in the Profession of Teaching: Past, Present and Future Perfect" (Robert R. Dunwell). (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283789

AGENDAS AND ARENAS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Grass

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 028 947

BEST COPY AVAILAB

INCENTIVES FOR EXCELLENCE:
AGENDAS AND ARENAS

JAMES R. GRESS
EDITOR

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
AND ALLIED PROFESSIONS
THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Monograph Contributors iii

Introduction iv

Chapter

1. A Profession under Siege: Teacher Recruitment and Certification
   James R. Johnson and Mary Jo Henning 1

2. A Comprehensive Teacher Education Recruitment Plan
   Ruth King 10

3. Types of Incentives
   Jon Schaffarzick 17

4. The Toledo Plan
   Terry Wyatt and Eileen Burch 34

5. Tennessee's Career Ladder for Teachers
   Barbara G. Burch 39

6. A Locally Developed Career Ladder
   Ralph J. Haws and L. Ray Brown. 49

7. Using Professional Development Centers and Career Ladders to Redesign the Teaching Profession
   Roy A. Edelfelt. 55

8. Teacher Self-Evaluation: A Model for a Professional Approach to Instructional Improvement
   Robert L. Scholl 62

9. Non-Monetary Incentives
   James J. Cellio and Claire L. Jacobi 71

10. Community Perspective on Teacher Incentives
    James R. Gress. 77

11. Excellence in the Profession of Teaching: Past, Present and Future Perfect
    Robert R. Dunwell. 85

This monograph was produced and disseminated pursuant to a grant award to The University of Toledo from the 1984 Teacher Incentive Structures Program, Secretary's Discretionary Fund, USDoE. The points of view expressed are those of the several authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Univerity or the USDoE. Parts of the monograph may be reproduced with permission of the editor.

1987

MONOGRAPH CONTRIBUTORS

L. Ray Brown. Deputy Superintendent, Jordan School District, Sandy, Utah

Barbara G. Burch. Professor, Associate Dean and Director of Graduate Studies, College of Education, Memphis State University

Eileen Burch. Teacher Consultant, School Consultation Program, Toledo Public Schools and Member, Board of Directors, Toledo Federation of Teachers

James J. Cellio. Biology Teacher, Maumee High School, Maumee, Ohio

Robert R. Dunwell. Professor and Chairman, Department of Education, Washburn University of Topeka, Kansas

Roy Edelfelt. Consultant, Edelfelt Johnson Consultants, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

James R. Gress. Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education, The University of Toledo

Ralph J. Haws. Administrator, Educational Program Services, Jordan School District, Sandy, Utah

Mary Jo Henning. Professor and Chairman, Department of Curriculum and Educational Technology, The University of Toledo.

Claire L. Jacobi. Administrative Assistant for Instruction, Maumee City Schools, Ohio

James R. Johnson. Professor and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, College of Education and Allied Professions, The University of Toledo

Ruth King. Assistant Professor and Director of Teacher Education, College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University

Jon Schaffarzick. Principal and Director of Public Sector Services, Western Region, Cresap, McCormick and Paget, Inc., San Francisco

Robert L. Scholl. Associate Professor of Education, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Terry Wyatt. Teacher Consultant, School Consultation Program, Toledo Public Schools and Member, Board of Directors, Toledo Federation of Teachers

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this monograph has changed somewhat as the dialogue and debate within and about the teaching profession has evolved in the past four years. An initial monograph focus was anticipated in our grant proposal to participate in the USDOE 1984 Teacher Incentive Structures Program. The Program, supported by the Secretary's Discretionary Fund, was a part of Terrel Bell's response (Bell, 1984) to the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). Our grant monograph would document the findings and recommendations of a local project and make a useful contribution to the dialogue and debate about excellence and the teaching profession.

The grant proposal for the Project to Design Teacher Incentive Structures (1986) identified a need for renewed excellence in teaching to address changing demographics both within the profession itself and in the elementary and secondary school student population (AACTE, 1982; Feistritzer, 1984; Hodgkinson, 1985; NCES, 1984). A number of national reports and representative state and regional legislative initiatives had underscored the importance of identifying a variety of incentives for continued educational excellence in a time of significant change.* The proposed project would involve local elementary and secondary school educators, community representatives and higher education experts in collaborative study of incentive structures.

Agendas for Excellence

Designing incentive structures for the teaching profession in order to maintain excellence in American schools presents a variety of agendas. For The Project to Design Teacher Incentive Structures, some separation of agendas was required. During 1984-85, a one-year planning grant supported work of six project task forces operated fairly independently of one another with some general direction set by a steering committee. Five task forces investigated alternative incentive structures addressing these respective agendas:

1. Teacher recruitment, preparation and certification;

2. Career ladders and master teacher roles;

3. School Staff development;

---

* National reports included Boyer (1983), the National Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology (1983), Gallup (1983), National Education Association (1982), Task Force on Education for Economic Growth (1983), Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy (1983), Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools (1981) and Weaver (1983). Other reports included State Board of Education (Ohio, 1984), State Superintendent's Task Force (1984), and Southern Regional Education Association (1983).

4. Merit pay;

5. Community/public relations.

A sixth task force planned project dissemination activities.

Project task forces were charged with addressing identified issues presented by the respective agendas and designing or adapting incentive structures for possible use in the schools, community, or university. As a first step, selected professional literature was reviewed. Literature review addressed task force agendas for teacher certification (Sikula and Roth, 1984), career ladders (ATE, 1985; ASCD, 1985), master teachers (Moore, 1984), staff development (Burke et al , 1984; Ingrassia, 1984) and merit pay (Johnson, 1984; Bacharack et al , 1984; McGuire and Thompson, 1984). Literature addressing more general agendas of changing teacher education (AACTE, 1982) and incentive structures (Cresap et al , 1984; Jung, 1984; Newcombe, 1983; Palaich and Flannelly, 1984) was also included. Additional perspective was brought to the respective agendas by review of literature on school organization and policy (Bird, 1984; Flannelly and Palaich, 1985), teacher evaluation (Solomon, 1984; Toledo Public Schools, 1983), costs (McGuire and Thompson, 1984), political ramifications and legal implications (Palaich, 1985; Rosenholtz, 1984; Belsches-Simmons, 1985), of teacher incentive structures.

As a second step, each task force collected school and community data locally that, together with the literature review, provided basis for designing locally acceptable incentive structures. Periodic steering committee meetings of task force representatives and other project personnel provided opportunities for synthesis and direction. As a final step, task forces prepared written findings and conclusions, and they recommended incentive structures for implementation. Reports of these findings, conclusions and recommendations are included among the chapters in this monograph.

Arenas for Change

During the preparation of this monograph, the identified agendas for excellence have stimulated continued discussion and debate, both at the local level and across the United States. A look at selected professional journals reveals that extensive attention has been given the agendas of teacher shortages (Cole, 1986B), recruitment and induction (Ishler, 1986/87), teacher education (Roth, 1986), competency testing, certification and accreditation (Haberman, 1984; 1986, Lasley, 1985), merit pay (Cole, 1985B), other rewards and incentives (Brandt, 1985), restructuring the profession and the future (Alley, 1984; Brandt, 1984/85; 1985; Cole, 1985A; National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985; Task Force for Teaching as a Profession, 1986) and the original debate about excellence (Cole, 1984). Discussion and debate of these agendas has taken place in addition to, but not apart from, the equally increasing amount of attention being given the substantive content of teacher preparation programs based on the significant research and development of the last two decades.

School districts and teacher education institutions across the country have given attention to these agendas as well. A variety of incentive initiatives have been made at the local level. In addition, thirteen states have fully implemented incentive plans, and twenty other states are developing or piloting such plans (Southern Regional Education Board, 1986). At the national level, three significant proposals for professional restructuring are the focus of study and debate in many arenas (NCATE, 1975; Task Force for Teaching as a Profession, 1986; The Holmes Group, 1986; Cole, 1986A; ATE, 1986). In arenas at the local, state and national levels, these three agendas, and all of the others, are bases for study, discussion, debate and action by all the constituent groups concerned with excellence in the schools and in the teaching profession.

In commenting on the Carnegie, Holmes and NCATE proposals, an ATE task force observed:

> Reaching consensus about the specific direction which second-wave teacher education and teaching reform efforts should take is anything but simple.... There are different agendas to coordinate and vested interests to be overcome in an arena which is very public and sensitive (ATE, 1986, p. 53).

The task force envisions a national network of states for the teaching profession, thus adding perhaps appropriately yet another agenda and arena for change.

In any case, incentives for continued excellence in the teaching profession and our schools have presented many agendas to be addressed in various arenas by teachers, other elementary and secondary school professional personnel, teacher educators, professional associations and unions, citizens and their political representatives, governmental units and agencies, and other constituent groups. This monograph is intended to contribute to that end.

One additional observation can be made here if an individual opinion were appropriate. Participation in collaborative elementary/secondary school-community-higher education endeavors, like the Project to Design Teacher Incentive Structures, reinforces two lessons about professional excellence. The first lesson is that professional excellence is, to an important extent, a matter of how individual professionals see excellence in themselves and their professional behaviors. Acknowledgement of excellence by others demands acknowledgement of excellence in how we see ourselves. The second lesson is that professional educators in the elementary/secondary school arena and those in the higher education arena must develop a collective professional self-concept and esteem which is dependent on their common professional role as teacher. They must see themselves, first, as teachers and, only secondarily, as employees in their different arenas.

The Monograph

Some monograph chapters are reports of The Project to Design Teacher Incentive Structures. In order to provide a more representative sampling of the agendas for excellence and arenas for change, however, additional chapters are included as well. The additional chapters were invited based on a review both of the state and local projects supported by the USDoE Teacher Incentive Program and presentations at the ATE, AACTE and ASCD national meetings in 1985 and 1986.

My colleague, James R. Johnson, and I have collaborated in each phase of the evolution of our USDoE project and this monograph. Sharing interests in teacher education and program development, Jim Johnson and I wrote the grant proposal together, and we assumed the respective roles of research coordinator and project director of practical necessity. We have collaborated, as well, in presentations at professional conferences and in developing the outline for this monograph.

Leadership in the grant project, and in its dissemination, was also given by Mrs. Claire Jacobi and Sr. Mary Ellen, Youngblood, OP. Preparation of the manuscript in computerized format was the work of Michelle Hudson and Mary Lou Barber whose efforts were clearly "beyond the call." Design of the monograph and printing were carried out under Thomas Durnford and The University of Toledo's Publications Office.

James R. Gress
Editor

References

Alley, Robert (ed.). "The Future and the Education Profession," Action in Teacher Education 6, Spring - Summer, 1984.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). Educating a Profession: Profile of a Beginning Teacher. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1982.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). Incentives for Excellence in America's Schools. Alexanderia, Virginia: The Association, 1985.

Association of Teacher Educators (ATE). Developing Career Ladders in Teaching. Reston, Virginia: The association, 1985.

_____. Visions of Reform: Implications for the Teaching Profession. Reston, Virginia: The Association Fall, 1986.

Bacharach, Samuel B., David B. Lipsky and Joseph B. Shedd. Paying for Better Teaching. Ithaca, New York: Organization Analysis and Practice, Inc., 1984.

Bell, Terrel H. The Peer Review Model for Managing a Career Ladder/Master Teacher/Performance Pay Program for Elementary and Secondary Schools. An Essay by the Secretary of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

Belsches-Simmons, Grace and Judith Bray. The Legal Context for Teacher Improvement. Denver: ECS, 1985.

Bird, Thomas. School Organization and the Rewards of Teaching. Denver: ECS, 1984.

Boyer, Ernest. High School. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1983.

Brandt, Ronald S. (ed.). "Making Teaching More Rewarding." Educational Leadership 42, November, 1985.

_____. "Reshaping the Teaching Profession," Educational Leadership 42, December - January, 1984/85.

Burke, Peter J., Judith C. Christensen and Ralph Fessler. Teacher Career Stages: Implications for Staff Development. Bloomington: PDK, 1984.

Cole, Robert W., Jr. (ed.). "After the Great Debate," Phi Delta Kappan 65, April, 1984.

_____. "The Carnegie and Holmes Group Reports," Phi Delta Kappan 68, September, 1986A.

_____. "The Teacher Shortage," Phi Delta Kappan, 67, June, 1986B.

_____. "Teaching Profession in the Year of the Teacher," Phi Delta Kappan 66, January, 1985A.

"A Way Out of the Merit Pay Morass," Phi Delta Kappan 67, October, 1985B.

Cresap, McCormick and Paget. Teacher Incentives: A Tool for Effective Management. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1984.

Feistritzer, Emily. The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Education and Certification. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information, 1984.

Flannelly, Ellen and Robert M. Palaich. Policy Guide to Teacher Reward Systems. Denver: ECS, 1985.

Gallup, George H. "The 15th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Kappan 66:23-38, September, 1983.

Haberman, Martin (ed.). "Competency Testing, State Certification, and Accreditation," Journal of Teacher Education 35, March - April, 1984.

_____. "Evaluating Alternative Certification, Action in Teacher Education 8, Summer, 1986.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. All One System: Demographics of Education--Kindergarten Though Graduate School. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1985.

Holmes Group, The Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Michigan: The Holmes Group, Inc., 1986.

Ingrassia, Sara and Sue Foley. Teacher Fairs: Counterpoint to Criticism. Bloomington: PDK, 1984.

Ishler, Peggy (ed.). "Recruiting and Inducting Quality Personnel for Schools, Action in Teacher Education 8, Winter, 1986/87.

Johnson, Susan Moore. Pros and Cons of Merit Pay. Bloomington: PDK, 1984.

Jung, Steven, M. Guidelines for Evaluating Teacher Incentive Systems. Denver: ECS, November, 1984.

Lasley, Thomas J. (ed.). "Alternative Credentialing: Problems, Perspectives and Proposals," Journal of Teacher Education 36, May-June, 1985.

McGuire, C. Kent and John A. Thompson. The Costs of Performance Pay Systems. Denver: ECS, 1984.

Moore, Richard W. Master Teachers. Bloomington: PDK, 1984.

National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

National Commission on Educational Excellence. A Nation at Risk, Final Report, Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1983.

National Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology. Educating Americans for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1983.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. A Call for Change in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1985.

National Education Association. Excellence in Our Schools, Teacher Education: An Action Plan. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1982.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. NCATE Redesign. Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1985.

Newcombe, Ellen. Rewarding Teachers: Issues and Incentives. Baltimore: Maryland Department of Education, 1983.

Palaich, Robert. How States Can Improve Teacher Quality. Denver, ECS, 1985.

_____. and Ellen Flannelly. Improving Teacher Quality Through Incentives. Denver: ECS, 1984.

Project to Design Teacher Incentive Structures. Improving Educational Quality in Maumee City Schools: Final Report. The University of Toledo, 1986.

Rosenholtz, Susan J. Political Myths About Reforming Teaching. Denver, ECS, 1984.

Roth, Robert A. Teaching and Teacher Education. Bloomington, Indiana: PDK, 1986.

Sikula, John P. and Robert A. Roth. Teacher Preparation and Certification: The Call for Reform. Bloomington: PDK, 1984.

Solomon, Lester M. Evaluating Teacher Performance. Denver: ECS, 1984.

Southern Regional Education Board. Meeting the Need for Quality: Action in the South. Atlanta: The Board, 1983.

_____. "1986--Incentive Programs for Teachers and Administrators: How Are They Doing?" Career Ladder Clearing House. Atlanta: The Board, 1986.

State Board of Education. Legislative Recommendations to the Governor and Members of the 116th General Assembly. Columbus, Ohio: The Board, 1984.

State Superintendent's Task Force. Teaching and Teacher Education, Final Report. Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, January, 1984.

Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools. Denver: ECS, 1983.

Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. Final Report. New York: 20th Century Fund, 1983.

Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools. The Need for Quality. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1981.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.

Toledo Public Schools. The Toledo Plan. Toledo: The Schools, 1983.

Weaver, W.T. America' Teacher Quality Problem: Alternatives for Reform. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1983.

CHAPTER 1

A PROFESSION UNDER SIEGE: TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND CERTIFICATION

James R. Johnson and Mary Jo Henning
The University of Toledo

Since the appearance of A Nation At Risk (National Commission on Educational Excellence, 1983), High School (Boyer, 1983), A Place Called School (Goodlad 1983) and other reports, Americans have experienced escalating doubts about the nature and quality of the public schools. Citizens and legislators alike harken to the rhetoric of Naisbitt (1982) and others who are sincerely convinced that this generation of young Americans are remarkably less able and well prepared academically than preceding generations.

Dedicated optimists point out that both society and the schools are different in the mid-80's than they were in the 50's, 60's, and 70's, and that teachers and their students are better prepared than ever before. Pessimists, who seem to possess a greater access to the media, counter with a perplexing series of statistics, research studies, and polemics which deepen the rift among constituents concerned with teacher education. Among the statistics most commonly calling into question both current schooling practices and the characteristics of those who choose teaching as a career are the SAT scores of those recently graduated from schools of education (NCES, 1982, p. 111).

In the period from 1973 until 1981, the SAT national mean fell from 445 in the verbal section to 426. In mathematics, the decline was from 481 to 466. Among teacher education students, the decline was more pronounced. Verbal scores fell from 418, almost 30 points below the national average, to 391. In mathematics, the decline was from 449 to 418. Although such performance might be accounted for, in part, by examining test items or by recognizing that differing populations took the test in 1973 and 1981, the perception of the casual observer is likely to raise legitimate concern.

Coupled with the public's acceptance of test data of questionable validity is the readiness of the media to publicize the negative image of schools and teachers. Representative of the media's inflammatory rhetoric is an article by Lyons (1979) entitled, "Why Teachers Can't Teach," appearing in the Texas Monthly. Lyons dramatizes the fact that 50% of Dallas Independent School District's first-year teachers failed the Wesman Personnel Classification Test. He cautions readers that "teachers who cannot read as well as the average sixteen-year-old, write notes free of barbarisms or handle arithmetic well enough to keep track of the field trip money" are holding forth in schools all over the state (Lyons, 1979, p. 124). Amid such empassioned rhetoric, where there is always some segment of truth, it is impossible for the average

"tax strapped" citizen to avoid embracing significant doubts about the success of schooling practices at all levels in this country. As Sykes (1983, p. 23) reminds us, it is easy in this context to worry about:

> who is entering teaching, how qualified the student teachers are, how adequate their preparation has been, whether new teachers are committed to their work, whether a teacher shortage looms, and what the future holds for the profession.

In the remainder of this chapter, we will document the alledged national emergency among the nation's teaching force and examine the merits of several incentives for renewed excellence in the profession. In particular, we will consider non-traditional recruitment and alternative certification proposals.

Teacher Supply and Demand: What Are the Facts?

During the decade from 1973 until 1983, the total U.S. population experienced a gain of 10.6 percent. During that same time, an aging population with a lower birth rate saw enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools shrink by 14 percent. The reduction in public school enrollments was not accompanied by a reduced teacher corps. For various reasons, the number of teachers grew 1.4 percent.

At the present time, demand exceeds supply to the degree that states are reinstituting plans for emergency certification in critical areas. If estimates are correct, we will need 15,000 more teachers in the current year. The major reason for increased demand clearly relates to two conditions. Because the birth rate was lower in the 1960's and 1970's, the demand for teachers diminished. Students who might have considered education as a career were counseled and/or forced by market conditions to select alternative careers. In the late 1970's, however, a "baby boomlet" led to an upturn in enrollments in preprimary and elementary schools in the mid-1980's which will continue through the 1990's. Said succinctly, "If current projections of people intending to go into teaching holds up, the country will experience a shortage of elementary teachers by the mid-1980's, just as the late 1970's bumper crop of babies is starting school" (Feistritzer, 1983, p. 26). In fact, that's what's happening.

At the other end of this problem is the number of persons ages 18-21 entering college who could decide upon a teaching career. In 1971, more than 20 percent of all bachelor's degrees conferred were in education. By 1981, this had slipped to less than 12 percent (NCES, 1983, p. 184). In addition, the number of entering freshmen aged 18-21 years of age is on the decline. Of those available in 1983, only 4.7 percent listed teaching as the probable occupation (NCES, 1983, p. 218).

Schwartz (1984) highlighted the issue of teacher supply and demand with the words of Professor Harold Hill, the sales drummer of Music Man fame. His memorable words included:

> Friends we have trouble, right here in River City. Yes, friends, we have Trouble, and that starts with T, and that rhymes with P, and that stands for Pool.

Schwartz cautioned us that we, too, have trouble with our pool--the pool of available teacher education candidates. In a hearing before the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, Schwartz (1984, p. 2) charged:

> The brightest and best students at a time when our public schools--and indeed our nation--needs them, are not going into the classroom, and those who do get there either have trouble finding a job or leave after the first few years of teaching. ...In summary, the trouble with our pool is that recent evidence suggests new recruits to teaching are leaving, less academically qualified than those who are although there is some evidence to indicate that they are as well qualified as the noneducation major students.

Schlecty and Vance (1983) echoed this view.

The Condition of Teaching

The profession of teaching is under siege. The specifics which have led them to this conclusion have been noted, in part, with the preceding summary of declining test scores among entering college freshmen who later become teachers. A closer inspection of specifics is alarming:

1. Among teachers entering the profession in 1973, almost 213 scoring in the top decile on the NTE have left the profession while only 1/3 of the bottom decile had sought other employment (Schlecty & Vance, 1981, pp. 106-112).

2. There are currently nationwide teaching shortages in math, physics, chemistry, computer science, biology and English (Association for School, College, and University Staffing, 1984).

3. Fewer than half of newly hired teachers in math and science were eligible for certification (NCES, 1985).

4. In 1981, 40 percent of respondents in an NEA survey reported that they would not enter the profession again if given a chance (NEA, 1982, pp. 73-76).

5. Among teachers in the profession who are most dissatisfied, the best qualified teachers (in content fields) have reported the greatest dissatisfaction with salary, working conditions, autonomy and bureaucracy (Darling-Hammond, 1984, p. 14).

6. Fewer than 5 percent of high school seniors who took the SAT in 1982 said they intended to major in education--down 50 percent since 1973 (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1983, p. 182).

7. College aspirants intending to major in education scored lower on standardized vocabulary, reading and mathematics achievement than other college bound seniors (Feistutzer, 1984, p. 88).

8. Young people recruited to teaching after 1970 have been well below the typical high school senior and college student in academic performance (Weaver, 1984, p. 39).

Taken together these data signal a major emergency for the teaching profession. Just at the time when our needs are the greatest and the profession is under public siege, qualified students are seeking other professions. In this situation, questions have never been clearer solutions never more elusive. Feistritzer (1984) puts the conslusion most explicitly:

> Nothing in American education is in greater need of reform than the way we educate and certify classroom teachers. Higher salaries, status and prestige for teachers will not be forthcoming until we are much more selective about who we let teach. Teaching will never be a true profession until it adopts "rites of passage" selection procedures at the entry level, as well as standards of excellence and competence on the job (p. 54).

Promising Incentives for Renewed Excellence

Certain incentives spawned by the teacher shortage have begun to produce potentially healthy results in some states. These incentives include non-traditional recruitment, strengthened state certification standards, and alternative certification paths.

At the heart of much discussion of teacher education is the concept and practice of certification. In theory, most states have established teacher certification standards as one mechanism of quality control for the teaching profession. Said simply, certification regulations have been established to keep charlatans out of the profession and to make it difficult for colleges to operate weak programs. The regulations, which differ remarkably from state to state, have become the bedrock upon which teacher education programs are designed.

Given the data noted above, it is little surprise that a portion of the public believes that regulations represent a cabal between state officials and education professors aimed at keeping education classes filled and professors employed. Obviously, such regulation has not protected the public from defective products. Investigation has shown that weak students are admitted to study and, all too frequently, find

positions as beginning teachers. This outcome has weakened the credibility of regulations as an incentive for professional excellence.

In the present circumstances, various states are moving in diametrically opposite directions to solve the problem. Ohio has sharply strengthened program approval standards. Education course content minimums have been more explicitly established, while standards have significantly increased and strengthened the general education background and academic specialization training of teachers in all fields. Thus, this state favors strengthening the standards colleges must meet in order to obtain program approval. At the other end of the sequence, Ohio has established a regulation requiring a competency test which any applicant for a teaching certificate must pass. At present, one proposal to achieve this concept is to have such a test created and administered by a Professional Practices Board composed of teachers, teacher educators and representatives of the public.

Others believe that professional excellence can't be enhanced through legal channels. Hawley is an articulate spokesperson for this position. He notes:

> The solution to the problems associated with teacher education is not regulatory reform; we need deregulation. Eliminate all state certification requirements and program approval procedures that define the content and process of teacher education. What would happen?... We might expect deregulation to lead to efforts by teacher education institutions to tailor their programs to the students most likely to be hired and most likely to enhance the reputations of the institutions themselves (cited in Mehlinger, 1987, p. 59).

Such deregulation is an avenue being explored by Indiana, several southern states, and New Jersey. Several state officials share Hawley's perspective while others endorse it merely because state school systems are not producing enough qualified teachers to answer the teacher shortage. Deregulation provides one means of opening the system to qualified teaching candidates who otherwise could not afford the time or money required to complete an elaborate certification program.

Alternative certification paths have been created. Using this mechanism, existing certification regulations are set aside or simplified to permit persons holding bachelor's and master's degrees in areas of shortage to obtain certification more easily. New Jersey was at the forefront of this movement as it unveiled a plan whereby a public school system could design certification plans in competition with colleges and universities. Generally, however, alternative certification programs are "designed for a different population from the usual 18-24 year undergraduate population... The fundamental differences are in the target audience, the training design, and the length of training, not in program content, rigor or expected outcomes" (Smith et al., 1985, p. 29).

However, a related view states that the primary objective of alternative certification routes is to increase the number of qualified secondary teachers by training and certifying arts and sciences graduates, particularly in such shortage areas as mathematics, the sciences, and foreign languages. Whatever reason one chooses to install such alternative routes, most programs presented to date have had the common element of competency assessment before entry into the classroom as protection for elementary and secondary students against poorly prepared teachers. The effects and validity of such testing for various alternative certification programs remains to be seen.

A third alternative being discussed among incentives to reduce the teaching shortage has been non-traditional recruitment. Recruitment ventures in this category have involved discussion of ways to attract four separate groups not currently in the teaching talent pool:

1. Academically able high school students;

2. Academically able graduates from excellent teacher certification programs;

3. Nontraditional candidates possessing academic expertise and no education training;

4. Previously trained and certified teachers who have sought employment in other segments of the economy.

In most cases, such nontraditional recruitment has been discussed in conjunction with alternative, or emergency, certification plans. On one hand, the incentive represents stop gap employment. On the other, it represents a real opportunity to revitalize professional excellence by employing additional bright, articulate professionals with potentially fresh ideas and insights to share.

Yet, it seems clear that the supply of teachers available will not be turned around by pursuing nontraditional recruitment ploys or opening alternative certification paths only. Carefully constructed incentive plans need to be available to attract and recruit both the most qualified high school seniors selecting a first career and those persons in other fields ready for a mid-career shift. Improving the image and attractiveness of teaching as a profession is fundamental. As long as teachers are paid sparingly, have few means to improve their economic position or obtain increased professional accord and responsibility, strong candidates may be expected to seek employment elsewhere.

Revitalizing the Teaching Profession: Some Considerations

Teaching has struggled for nearly two hundred years to establish professional excellence. However, the deep traditions of public control of schools preclude for teachers the autonomy given to other professions. While educators have long since established the disciplines of knowledge, the research base and the methods of inquiry necessary to professional excellence, they have often lost the initiative in charting

their professional directions. These things are not likely to change. Nevertheless, the time is now ripe to strengthen the image of teachers as professionals as we move to ensure excellence among teaching candidates and inductees. As Martin has observed, "It is essential that educators, and teacher educators in particular, recapture the initiative so that the reform movement can be shaped and controlled appropriately" (1987, p. 55). Such revitalization must take several forms:

1. **Rigorous entry standards must be established for teacher education programs.** Reform in this area must be cautious. We need the best and brightest persons in a profession. Restrictive admission is an important devise for attracting such individuals. However, restrictive admissions will not be embraced enthusiastically by colleges of education, if closing admissions leads to revenue declines and faculty cuts. Raising standards to get into programs is a must. The students are available; attracting and keeping them is the problem.

2. **Teaching professionals must design examinations which fairly assess the knowledge base minimally expected to make educational decisions.** Such tests should not designed to expose teachers of limited ability in reading, writing and computation. College program admission and graduation requirements should ensure teacher literacy. It must become given that entry into the classroom should be assessed by the ability to demonstrate basic content competence before entry into the field. Such assessment should touch both academic specialization and professional education. Such tests should be designed and researched carefully before being used to exclude anyone.

3. **Permanent certification should be directly linked to a year long professional internship under the supervision of a master teacher who possesses appropriate experience, academic credentials and success in supervision.** This suggestion, while not a new one, nevertheless, deserves consideration. Student teaching should be only a gate to an internship. Prospective professionals need to have the responsibility of being a teacher, drawing a salary, and working fulltime in order to be assessed and assess themselves fairly. Recent success with induction programs supports the merit of this concept. Schools would obtain the services of prospective teachers for low costs while not being compelled to offer a contract to anyone who has not demonstrated consistent ability in a full time experience.

4. **Teachers themselves must define the rigorous standards of practice acceptable for professional certificates.** At present, teachers and their organizations cede certification matters to legislators, state department officials, and lay leaders. Too often, educators resist rather than shape the minimum standards for their profession. Such a posture promotes mediocrity, protects incompetence and creates public doubt, suspi-

cion and lack of confidence. As teachers take a more vigorous professional posture in policing their own ranks, public confidence in professional accountability may be expected to increase.

5. Teachers and the public must work together to encourage a variety of incentive structures to be available in a publicly supported profession. Without increased rewards to accompany increased competence with increased responsibility, an individual has few incentives for initiative, creativity or imagination except altruism. If the mark of a true professional is autonomous performance and goal directed behavior related to professional practice, there must be some incentives for doing so including recognition, encouragement and economic investment.

Taken together, these incentives seem likely to promote a new confidence in and among teachers as a group. For too long a time, teachers have been content to conform grudgingly to the expectations of their increasingly demanding client public without long dialoguing their own sense of professional direction and excellence. With the pressure for renewed excellence, the shortage of teachers, and a public who seems to understand professional behavior, responsibility and accountability, the time is upon us to seize the initiative and decide whether teaching will be a profession marked by renewed excellence or merely a profession consistently under seige!

References

Association for School, College and University Staffing. Teacher Supply/Demand, Madison, Wisconsin, 1984.

Boyer, E. L. High School. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1983.

Darling-Hammond, L. Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1984.

Feistritzer, E. The American Teacher. Washington, D.C.: Fustritzer Publication, 1983a.

Feistritzer, E. The Condition of Teaching: A State by State Analysis. New York: The Carnegie Foundation, 1983b.

Feistritzer, E. The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Education and Certification. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information, 1984.

Goodlad, J. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Lyons, G. Why teachers can't teach. Texas Monthly, 1979, (September), 123-8.

Martin, D. Professional credibility through wider links. Educational Horizons, 1987, 65(2), 55-57.

Mehlinger, H. D. Simple but radical reform of teacher education. Educational Horizons, 1987, 65(2), 58-61.

Naisbitt, J. Megatrends. New York: Warner Books, 1982.

National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education, 1982. Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1982.

National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education, 1983, Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1984.

National Center for Education Statistics. The Digest of Education, 1982. Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1982.

National Commission on Educational Excellence. A Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1983.

National Education Association, Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1980-81, Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1982.

Schlecty, P.C. and Vance, V.S. Institutional responses to quality/quantity issue in teacher training. Phi Delta Kappan, 1983, October, 94-101.

Schwartz, H. Recruitment, selection, retention and graduation of teacher education candidates. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, 1984 (ED 250-308).

Smith, D.C., Nystrand, R., Ruch, C., Gideonse, H., & Carlson, K. Alternative certification: A position statement of AACTE. Journal of Teacher Education, 1985, 36(3), 24.

Weaver, W. T. Solving the problem of teacher quality, part 1. Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1984, 108-115.

Weaver, W. T. America's Teacher Quality Problem: Alternatives for Reform. New York: Praeger, 1983.

CHAPTER 2

A COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER EDUCATION RECRUITMENT PLAN

Ruth King
Wright State University

Enrollment in our college is booming. Colleagues in other colleges of education report similar enrollment pressures. For some reason, more eighteen and nineteen year olds are choosing to become teachers. Perhaps the media reports of imminent teacher shortages have created the demand. Perhaps the national debate over standards has made teaching a more credible vocation. Perhaps other, more subtle, influences are at work. Half a dozen inquiries from blind students, for example, have been received since the new TV show "Mr. Sunshine" first aired. Whatever the source, we find ourselves with more applicants than we can accommodate. Is this the time to develop a recruitment plan? At Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio, we believe it is.

We believe that it is time because a recruitment plan helps to focus our efforts on goals that are related to the mission of the College of Education and Human Services, which includes attracting able students to our programs, raising standards, and attracting culturally diverse populations to the profession. To meet these goals, the college has initiated several new programs and policies that form part of a comprehensive plan to recruit, select and retain potentially talented teachers. Described here are three of these special programs: (1) the Teacher Education Honors Scholar Program, (2) the Accelerated Certification Program, and (3) the Multicultural Recruitment/Scholarship Program.

The Teacher Education Honors Scholar Program

This program was designed to attract "the best and brightest" high school seniors to the Wright State Teacher Education Program. Up to fifteen full-tuition scholarships are awarded each year to students who are in the top 10% on the SAT or ACT, who show evidence of a strong commitment to teaching and community service, and who are recommended by their high school teachers. Personal interviews are conducted with all finalists. These scholarships are renewed annually for up to four years as long as students maintain eligibility. The criteria for continuing eligibility are full-time enrollment earning at least thirty-six hours per year; maintenance of a 3.0 cumulative grade point average; meeting all requirements of the prescribed teacher education program and the university and college honors programs.

Recruitment during the program's pilot year included flyers sent to guidance counselors in a five-county area. This

netted twenty-one applicants of which eleven met our criteria. The eleven, and four others who met most criteria or showed promise in some intangible way, were invited for interviews. The interviews were conducted by a committee made up of four education faculty and the Director of the university honors program. Two of the committee members also regularly sit on the university honors scholarship interview committee. Nine students, all of whom met all criteria, were offered scholarships. Five accepted; four declined.

At this point, it was decided to re-open the search and a statewide mailing was sent with a rolling admission date. This resulted in several more interviews and two additional scholarship recipients. Just before the opening of school in September, one candidate withdrew because she was unable to pay the housing fee.

The first-year group of five women and one man started in the fall of 1984. Four planned to be elementary teachers; one a social studies teacher; and one a foreign language teacher. All have remained in the program and are doing well.

The second year's recruitment was handled by the university Admissions Office. The interview procedure was used, with the addition of a teacher education honors scholar to the committee. Six of eleven students who were offered scholarships accepted them. This time all were women. Three of this group planned to be secondary English teachers; one a secondary math teacher; one a secondary spanish teacher; and one an elementary teacher. In both years, at least half the applicants came from small rural towns.

The third group has now been recruited, and nine scholarships awarded for 1986-87. Two recipients are men and seven women. Three plan to be secondary math teachers; one a physics teacher; another a social studies teacher. Two plan to be elementary teachers; one a special education teacher; and one young man a coach.

In selecting our scholarship students, we have made sure that they meet the same criteria as the university honors scholars. Only seven university honors scholars were awarded for 1984-85. Our six students, therefore, almost doubled the number of students entering the university honors program on scholarships. Since then, the university has substantially increased the number of honors scholarships that are offered, but the Teacher Education Honors Scholars are still a significant proportion of the total university honors scholars. As university honor scholars, they are required to take six honors sections in their general education program and two university honors seminars. Our students take these courses along with honors scholars in other majors. This provides them with two identities, one in the education honors program and one as university scholars.

Entry into the teacher education program normally starts in the sophomore year. In order to provide the link with teacher education during their freshman year, an honors scholar seminar is scheduled each quarter. The seminar provides opportunity for students' getting to know one another, having personal contact with education faculty, and being introduced to the profession. The topics for these seminars vary according to faculty interest. This past year, the first seminar consisted of an introduction to the variety of schools in the area. Faculty and students visited an inner-city junior high school, a wealthy suburban high school, a pre-school program, classrooms for handicapped and gifted students, an alternative school and a private Christian school. The second seminar examined education on a global scale by bringing in nationals to talk about education in their respective countries, focusing on the relationships among the educational system, the values of the culture and the goals of the society. Exchange faculty and foreign students spoke about education in Iran, Brazil, China, Japan, Niger, Israel, Mexico and England. The third seminar focused on futurology and provided students with opportunity to do some global futures mapping.

These seminars were organized in response to the recognition of the limited backgrounds of the students in the program. Few, we discovered in the interviews, had ever traveled, or read newspapers, or questioned local customs. Most came from small rural high schools. These seminars were designed to broaden their perspectives of their profession, their world, and their own futures.

During the sophomore year, student scholars feed into the regular program in classes of approximately thirty students. Mentoring is a strong feature of our undergraduate program. Students usually remain in mentor groups for three quarters during the introductory phase of the teacher education program. Mentors have not been told which of the students are honors scholars.

As juniors and seniors, honors scholars are required to complete a two-quarter education honors research project under the direction of an education faculty adviser. At the conclusion of the study, the student gives an oral report to the group and to a faculty committee.

In an effort to determine whether the "best and brightest" really become superior teachers, the college is tracking these students throughout their programs and into their first years of teaching. We are using a general research strategy called "illuminative evaluation" (Parlett & Dearden, 1977). This model is a flexible, multi-method approach that relies on accurate description and reporting. We are periodically conducting interviews, making observations, documenting student experiences and collecting samples of their work. A matched group of non-honors

scholars is being examined as well. It is too early to report any findings.

The Accelerated Certification Program

This program did not begin as an effort to recruit the best and brightest. However, it did just that. The program started when we realized that we were getting appreciable numbers of older students with degrees who wanted to be certified. These students frequently were discouraged by the time commitment necessary in order to meet our certification requirements. When the program began in 1979-80, the schedule of courses was designed for the eighteen or nineteen-year-old sophomore who was taking both general and professional education courses spread over three or more years.

A rearrangement of the schedule of course offerings was made so that persons who had baccalaureate degrees with substantial coursework in a teaching field could take a full-load of professional education courses each quarter. For secondary majors, that meant being able to complete professional coursework in 9-12 months. For elementary majors, completion might take 15 months. What had been a three-quarter, fourteen-hour sequence of introductory courses (foundations, learning theories, multicultural teaching, classroom management) can now be completed in a single quarter. Teaching skills, curriculum and materials courses can also be completed in one quarter for secondary majors and in two for elementary majors. The last quarter, consists of full-time student teaching and a senior seminar.

One faculty member in the foundations area asked to teach a special section of the introductory courses as full load during fall quarter. Since this would also be the students' full load, the arrangement of courses and their location could be flexible. The faculty member chose to make this a field-based quarter. An inner-city school was chosen, and an empty classroom was made available to the university. Anything the school could not provide in the line of tables, adult chairs, bookshelves, cabinets and the like was trucked in from the university for the quarter and trucked back after the quarter was over.

The entire eleven weeks was spent at the school. Students and their faculty mentor/instructor arrived at school each day with the teachers and left when they did. The program participants spent their mornings in classrooms, ate lunch either as a group or with the teachers, and met in their on-site classroom during the afternoons for the introductory courses.

The advantages of this arrangement were profound. Students brought to their afternoon courses the questions and problems encountered in classrooms that morning. They brought ideas and insights from the university courses immediately back to their work with children. The advantage to the school was

that teachers had extra help and were able to observe new ideas that our students brought to the classroom. The advantage to the children was that teachers planned more carefully and cared more about what they did when they had constant university observers.

Students were able to choose three different teachers to work with during the quarter. They were able to observe the affects of different teaching and discipline styles on student performance and behavior. They also took turns working with the gym teacher, the administration, the librarian, and the specialty teachers. Because the university classroom was available for other uses most mornings, participants could bring small groups or individual children to a separate environment to work with them. The certification candidates also provided special events, such as a multicultural fair, to which classes were invited. Part of the success of the program was the acceptance of this group by the school staff and the friendships that developed.

After two years, the board of education closed down the antiquated 107-year-old school which had been the site for this program. Other arrangements had to be made. Each year, however, the program has been refined and modified so that, now into its seventh year, a basically new program has emerged.

Today, the Accelerated Certification Program provides a masters degree option which most students elect. Students are in the schools for half of each day during the two quarters preceding student teaching. With the exception of the curriculum and materials course in the student's teaching field, all classes are taken as a group. A group of faculty have been identified to work with this special population. The faculty recognize the maturity and special strengths of these post-baccalaureate students and have modified, not the content, but the process of their teaching to accommodate student learning styles. The group is limited to thirty students.

With few exceptions, the quality of these certification candidates greatly exceeds that of entering students. They bring to their training a determination and commitment, a self-confidence and maturity, experiences and skills not usually evident in younger students. Typically, they have always had a desire to teach, but were dissuaded or unable to carry out their ambition for a variety of reasons. Instead they worked in labs, industry, and offices, ran their own businesses, served in the Peace Corps or the military. They made their livings as artists, journalists, performers, and university teachers; they raised families. They had come to points in their lives when they felt they could make a career change and to do what they had always wanted to do -- teach.

On tests of basic skills, they rank a full standard deviation above the mean, many going off the top of the scales. Their GPA's have been outstanding even though they take a very full and demanding course load. They do exceptionally well in their student teaching, and they get jobs. Follow-up studies indicate that they enjoy teaching, feel that they are well-prepared by the program, and rate the field-based aspect of the program very highly.

This group of students has been, by and large, self-selected. During the program's first few years, we contacted the hometown newspapers of participants to tell their stories. Whenever possible, we sent out news releases. Each student was a human interest story and brought in more inquiries. The only brochure that was printed became obsolete before it was fully distributed. All recruitment is now by word of mouth and reputation. What we have done is to provide the opportunity and the support services to help this population to meet their goals. They have come to us from Mississippi, South Carolina, Boston, Philadelphia, New York City, the Island of Palau, the Isle of Man, and Greece. They have left us to accept jobs in Colorado, California, Washington, Florida, and upper New York State. They are sprinkled throughout our own region and are sought by local school districts. We are pleased to be able to supply our schools with such dedicated and competent professionals.

The Multicultural Recruitment/Scholarship Program

The Multicultural Recruitment Program is designed to identify academically able minority high school sophomores, juniors and seniors who demonstrate interest in teaching and to provide them with continuous intervention, interaction and support from the College of Education and Human Services throughout their high school and college careers. This is a pilot program initiated by the college with partnership schools. A summer enrichment program, skills building, clinical training, and student mentors are features of the program. Those who successfully complete the program and meet entry criteria are awarded full-tuition scholarships.

The program responds to national statistics showing fewer Black and other minority students enrolling in colleges, in general, and in teacher education in particular. This pattern of enrollment occurs at a time when the proportion of minority students in our elementary and secondary schools is increasing. Black and other minority students are underrepresented in our college. Recent efforts to raise standards by requiring minimum scores on the Pre-Professional Skills Tests (PPST) for entrance into teacher education and on the Core Battery and Specialty Tests of the National Teachers' Examination (NTE) for graduation and certification probably pose additional hurdles for minority students. It is to help counteract these trends that the program was developed.

The program has an Advisory Committee of three representatives of area public schools and four university administators, including two responsible for minority affairs. These committee members advise program's coordinator on matters of recruitment, funding and candidate selection and on related matters.

Summer programs bring selected students to the university for enrichment courses, tutoring in individual skills building and test taking, clinical training with children, participation in arts and recreation programs, and career counseling. Financial aid is provided as well. Students already in the Honors Scholar Program serve as mentors to these high school students during the school year.

The college can make available up to fifteen scholarships for qualified candidates from its own resources. Plans are underway to solicit support for additional scholarships from the university, foundations, service clubs and professional associations. It is our hope that these groups will sponsor individual student's participation in the program. The first students will be enrolling in this program in 1986-87.

Conclusions

These initiatives on the part of the teacher education program at Wright State University are in line with recommendations made by the various commissions and others in their recent reports on teacher education. The initiatives address the need for preparing highly qualified professionals. They meet our college mission and program priorities. They supplement the efforts already made in our college, and in the state, to raise standards to higher levels of excellence in the preparation of teachers. We have done what we can recognizing that, in themselves, these recruitment initiatives are only a beginning.

Reference

Partlett, Malcom and Garry Dearden. Introduction to Illuminative Evaluation: Studies in Higher Education. Cardiff-by-Sea, CA: Pacific Soundings Press, 1977.

CHAPTER 3

TYPES OF INCENTIVES*

Jon Schaffarzick
Cresap, McCormick and Paget, Inc.

Five categories of incentives that may be employed by school districts to attract, motivate, and retain highly qualified teachers are:

1. Compensation Plans (including Merit Pay and Bonuses). Various modifications in salary schedules, benefits, and perquisites to reward teachers and to address specific needs in attracting and retaining particular types of teachers.

2. Career Options (including Career Ladders). Various modifications in he traditional structure of the teaching career.

3. Enhanced Professional Responsibilities (including Master Teacher plans). Ways of increasing teachers' compensation and making the job more interesting by extending and varying teachers' responsibilities.

4. Non-monetary Recognition: Awards and other ways of motivating teachers through attention to their accomplishments.

5. Improved Working Conditions: Ways of making teaching more professional and enjoyable (and therefore more attractive) by improving the physical and social conditions under which teachers work.

* * *

This chapter describes the various types of incentives and analyzes their advantages and disadvantages. These analyses focus on eight factors considered particularly important in choosing among incentives:

---

* Reprinted with permission from Cresap, McCormick and Paget, Inc., Teacher Incentives: A Tool for Effective Management (Washington, D.C.: NASSP, NAESP and AASA, 1985). Original work contains summary figures as well as full text.

1. Ability to attract and retain teachers.

2. Ability to motivate teachers.

3. Reasonableness of cost.

4. Potential impact (likely general level of change that can be expected from use of an incentive).

5. Importance of performance appraisal (extent to which difficult technical requirements associated with such appraisals will have to be met).

6. Degree of required change (extent to which a district will have to change its organization, staffing, or procedures to adopt an incentive).

7. Ease of administration.

8. Likely acceptability (including, particularly, acceptability to teachers and community members).

Following the descriptions of the five categories are summary analyses of the various incentives' strengths and weaknesses and likely relative levels of resource requirements.*

* * *

COMPENSATION PLANS

Many of the incentives that are attracting considerable attention involve changes in the amounts of and/or bases for teachers' monetary compensation, including salaries, benefits, and perquisites. Seven types of compensation-related incentive plans are discussed here.

BE AN INCENTIVE · BE A TEACHER
PROJECT TO DESIGN TEACHER INCENTIVE STRUCTURES
THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

*For a listing of existing teacher incentive systems, readers should consult the Educational Research Service's recent report, "Merit Pay Plans for Teachers: Status and Descriptions (ERS, 1983).

Performance-Based Salaries

Merit Pay. One of the most direct ways of recognizing and rewarding superior teaching is to vary annual salary increases as a function of performance. The most common form is merit pay, to pay outstanding teachers more to continue teaching well, rather than to assume additional responsibilities. Merit is determined through use of a performance appraisal system, and the teachers who perform best are given larger raises. A range of increases may be established to reflect many different levels of performance quality, or extra amounts may be given to just those teachers judged outstanding.

* * *

Modified Salary Schedule. Another approach is to add a third factor (performance) to the two factors traditionally used to determine annual salary increases (cost of living adjustment and years of experience). Each year the school board adopts a salary increase matrix, with the columns representing years of experience (up to a maximum, which might vary according to degrees and credits earned) and the rows representing ranges of performance appraisal points.

The percentage increase adopted for each cell in the matrix is based on all three factors (cost of living adjustment, years of experience, and performance). Percentage increases in the bottom row (representing unsatisfactory performance) might be held to zero (that is no increase for any of the three factors). Each teacher's annual salary increase is the percent indicated in the cell designated for his or her performance and experience. In time, teachers' salaries would vary substantially as a result of differences in percentage increases received over the years.

Strengths and Weaknesses... Overall, the purported advantages of performance-based pay are that it can improve the morale and retention of superior teachers, motivate all teachers to improve, and focus attention on instruction. These schemes raise some critical issues and dangers, however, and must be addressed very carefully.

All performance-based plans require an adequately valid, reliable, objective performance appraisal method and qualified, well-trained evaluators. These criteria are not easy to meet. It may be difficult to reach agreement on such critical features as selection criteria and methods, responsibility for assessment and decision making, types and sizes of rewards, and whether salary increases are to be kept confidential or publicized. There are dangers that rewards will be given to the same people year after year, that conformity (rather than creativity) will be encouraged, and that competition, jealousy, and parental pressure will replace collegiality. If sufficient funds are not available, rewards may be too small to provide motivation. Variations in teaching objectives and circumstances cause measurement and selection difficulties.

Merit pay plans have a poor overall track record in education (see, for example, Educational Research Service, 1983), but they have worked well in some districts. Some people believe that the dangers of performance-based pay outweigh the potential advantages, but the fate of such plans is always a function of individual districts' circumstances and the appropriateness and quality of specific plans.

Bonuses

Bonuses, sums of money given on a one-time basis, can address a variety of purposes. They may be offered to outstanding college graduates to induce them to enter teaching rather than take jobs in other fields. They may be given as annual performance rewards, rather than salary increases...

Bonuses may also be used to accomplish high-priority community goals, such as attracting strong candidates in areas of shortage (such as science or mathematics), encouraging teachers to teach at inner-city schools or other schools that have more difficulty in attracting teachers, or improving teacher attendance.

* * *

Bonuses may be awarded to teams, departments, grade levels, schools, or even whole districts, as well as individuals... It is hoped that teachers will be motivated to help one another and that pressure will develop to dismiss incompetent teachers... Participation in the bonus program is voluntary. Bonuses are not part of salary and are not carried forward to the following year.

Strengths and Weaknesses... Because receipt of a bonus one year does not guarantee a bonus the following year, motivation to perform well is renewed annually. Bonuses do not affect base salaries in succeeding years or retirement costs, thereby reducing long-term budget requirements.

If confidentiality is desired (to avoid demoralizing teachers who do not receive rewards or who receive smaller rewards), it may be easier in some states to keep information about bonuses (as opposed to salary increases) secret. If bonuses are tied to the achievement of agreed-upon objectives, teachers will be encouraged to design and attempt specific needed improvements, additional expenditures can be shown to reflect additional effort and accomplishment, and the basis for rewards is relatively objective. Teachers need not be forced to participate (if bonus programs are voluntary), and teachers are able to select their own areas of attention and emphasis.

On the other hand, there are some potential disadvantages to bonuses. Funds for bonuses may be more vulnerable to budget cutting than funds for salary increases. Also, if the program is voluntary, some of the best teachers may choose not to participate and, as a

result, some superior classroom effort and performance may go unrewarded.

Market-Sensitive Salaries

School districts typically have more difficulty in attracting highly qualified (or even certified) teachers in some subject areas than in others because of fluctuations in supply and demand. For example, many districts are currently finding it difficult to find enough adequately trained math and science teachers. Some districts are experiencing shortages of bilingual and special education teachers. The types and severity of the shortages vary by geographical location, depending on market conditions.

In addition to offering bonuses to teachers in areas of shortage, another approach to this problem is to establish market-sensitive salaries. Recommended in the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, this approach identifies areas of shortage and establishes differentiated starting salaries and salary schedules, corresponding with the differentiated market rates in the subject area. (For example, the relative level of beginning teacher salaries would change with the relative demand for persons with different skills in the marketplace.)

Strengths and Weaknesses. This plan has the advantage of paying what is required to attract and retain appropriately skilled teachers. It makes salary distinctions not based on experience or degrees. If the main cause of difficulty in attracting talented math and science teachers is the gap between what they can earn in teaching and in other occupations requiring similar training, this plan should help solve the shortage problem.

The plan's main weakness is its fundamental impact on current salary arrangements. It requires a new salary structure (which is subject to negotiation in many districts) and would not be achieved without struggle. Furthermore, as it changes the definition of "equity" among teacher salaries, many incumbent teachers would be affected negatively. Finally, as market conditions change, there would be the continued need to revise salary schedules. There is also the technical difficulty of defining the market for cost comparison purposes.

Salary Differentiation Based on Job Factors

Most existing teacher salary plans not only ignore variations in the markets for teachers with different qualifications, but they also assume that all teaching positions are equal in job requirements, difficulty, and importance.

It is possible to use the analytic techniques that differentiate among administrative and supporting services positions to establish distinct teaching classifications that are based on specified job factors. Although many aspects of teaching would be similar across subject areas and grade levels, some clearly would vary. Examples of job factors

which might distinguish one group of teachers from another would include:

1. **Knowledge and Skills.** This is generally defined as the range and depth of information and understanding required, and the level of ability needed to apply that knowledge to the functions of the position; ratings differ depending on complexity and difficulty of the knowledge and skill demands and the type of knowledge and skills required to achieve objectives.

2. **Impact and Accountability.** This is defined as the degree to which the position is instrumental in achieving the organization's goals.

By using factors such as these, teaching positions can be ranked and related to the relevant job markets. Salary grades can be established for clusters of teaching positions, with each grade having its own set of salary steps.

Strengths and Weaknesses. The potential advantages of salaries based on job factors are that they provide different rewards to teachers who face different job requirements, and they can be directly linked to the achievement of district goals. For example, the teaching of effective writing may be rewarded differently than physical education instruction, depending on specific communities' values and objectives and on an assessment of the relative knowledge and skills required for each position.

Two fundamental problems with implementing such plans are:

1. The establishment of an effective job evaluation system and the achievement of agreement on the relative worth of different teaching jobs will be difficult.

2. This type of plan cuts to the heart of assumptions underlying existing salary schedules, would require negotiation in many districts, and would likely encounter resistance from teachers.

Loan Forgiveness and Scholarships

To attract recent college graduates in areas of shortage, or graduates with outstanding records and potential in all areas, school districts might offer to make educational loan payments during each year of employment, until the loans are paid off. (Students who have not had to obtain loans for their education might be given an equivalent amount in cash.) At an earlier stage, outstanding prospects who are still in college might be given scholarships with the proviso that they

teach in the district at least one year for each year of scholarship support.

Strengths and Weaknesses. The opportunity to have loans repaid may be a sufficient additional financial inducement to attract some persons who otherwise would not consider teaching. On the other hand, if private companies or other competing organizations really want the same people, they may be in a better position to do the same thing and more.

Offering such assistance to some teachers but not others may create morale problems among the others, and may even face legal obstacles in some states. A danger of offering scholarships to outstanding college students who appear to be promising future teachers is that it is difficult to identify people who will make good teachers that early. Also, it may be costly and aggravating to try to recover funds from people who renege on their promises, as evidenced by the difficulties experienced by the federal government in recovering money from loan recipients.

Table 1. Purposes of Teacher Incentives.

I = Attract High Quality Teachers
II = Retain Superior Teachers
III = Motivate Effort and Improvement
IV = Accomplish Other Community Goals

Types of Incentive	Purpose I	II	III	IV
Compensation Plans				
*Performance-Based Salaries	*	*	*	
*Bonuses	*	*	*	*
*Market-Sensitive Salaries	*	*		*
*Salary Differentiation Based on Job Factors	*	*		
Loan Forgiveness and Scholarships	*			
*Grants, Sabbaticals, Training		*	*	
*Modification in Base Salaries and Benefits	*	*		
Career Options				
*Career Ladders	*	*	*	
*Short-Term Career	*			
*Part-Time and Joint Appointments	*	*	*	
*Early Retirement	*			
Enhanced Professional Responsibilities				
*Master Teacher Assignments		*	*	
*Teacher Projects		*	*	
*Longer Day or Year	*	*	*	
Nonmonetary Recognition		*	*	
Improved Working Conditions	*	*	*	

Grants, Sabbaticals and Training

Superior performance may be rewarded and tired teachers may be renewed through sabbaticals, grants for special projects, or participation in special training opportunities.

* * *

Strengths and Weaknesses. Recognition through such means is attractive in many respects; it is non-threatening, positive, and capable of contributing to professional growth. Furthermore, such programs need not be costly. Teachers on sabbatical can be paid less than their normal salaries (say, 50 to 70 percent), for example, and can be replaced temporarily by beginning teachers at the low end of the salary schedule. This also allows the district to observe some young candidates for teaching positions, yielding more information on which to base hiring decisions.

Modifications in Base Salaries and Benefits

Across-The-Board Salary Increases. Teachers' organizations assert that almost all teachers' salaries are too low relative to compensation offered for comparable professional positions and that performance-based plans will invert funds from base salary increases. An opposing viewpoint is that paying all teachers a standard additional amount will do little to motivate improved performance and that opportunities for better performers to earn more will attract and retain the most qualified persons while justifying greater expenditures to the community.

Higher Starting Salaries. If a district is experiencing more difficulty in attracting strong candidates to its teaching positions than in retaining its best teachers, it might consider raising entry level salaries rather than salaries at all levels. This approach clearly costs less than raising the entire salary schedule, but it has the drawback of creating salary compression: the rate of increase beyond the starting years will diminish, which may demoralize older teachers.

Flexible Benefits. Many school districts are currently considering "cafeteria plans" for their fringe benefits programs. Such plans allow employees to vary their combinations of benefits to meet individual needs. For example, a teacher who already has health insurance under his or her spouse's employer's plan may opt for more coverage in another area or even cash rather than the unneeded coverage.

Flexible benefit plans might be used to help attract and retain good teachers and to improve morale and motivation by improving responsiveness to individual needs. People considering might be offered cash rather than benefits in order to increase their immediate income. (They may not yet be interested in building toward retirement, and they may be willing to take larger risks in health coverage.)

The limits of such plans are usually restricted by factors beyond the school district's control, however. The scope and flexibility allowable under existing laws remain unsettled. The Internal Revenue Service has not yet issued final regulations under the enabling tax law, and it recently limited the flexibility under some parts of the Internal Revenue Code more severely than previously anticipated. Moreover, most retirement plans are run by states and allow little or no local discretion. Thus, rather than being able to offer flexibility in the full amount of fringe benefits (which typically amount to 25 to 33 percent of base salary), districts will most likely be limited to offering flexibility in benefits amounting to 5 to 15 percent o base salary.

CAREER OPTIONS

Beyond modifications in compensation plans and the provision of opportunities for teachers to raise their salaries through the assumption of additional responsibilities, more fundamental possibilities may exist in restructuring the teaching career in various ways to attract, motivate, and retain larger number of highly qualified persons. These possibilities include career ladders, the concept of teaching as a short-term career for most, part-time and joint appointments, and greater use of early retirement.

Career Ladders

The basic purposes of career ladders are:

1. To encourage good tachers to stay in the profession by providing advancement possibilities within teaching.

2. To counteract stagnation by varying teachers' responsibilities and activities at each level.

3. To reward and motivate superior teachers through enhanced prestige, responsibility, and increased remuneration.

Career ladders typically have three or four levels, including some combination of entry (or probationary, or apprentice), continuing (or regular, or career), senior, and master (or mentor) categories. All new teachers must begin at the entry level. While at this level they are on probation, it is easier to decide not to renew their contracts during this period, before they achieve "tenure." Minimum and maximum number of years in the entry level may be specified (with dismissal possible if a teacher fails to qualify for the net level by the end of the maximum period). Teachers entering a district with teaching experience elsewhere normally must remain in the entry level category for shorter periods than brand new teachers.

Advancement to higher levels usually may occur only after a specified number of years at the current level and is based on some combination of performance, accomplishment, years of experience, and level of educational attainment. As teachers advance to higher levels, they are given new titles (for example, "master teacher"), higher pay (for example, $1,000 to $3,000 per level), and more responsibility (for example, assisting and training other teachers).

Because master teachers have somehow demonstrated superior achievement and competence, they are usually asked to spend some of their time observing and assisting other teachers, training other teachers, leading instructional improvement efforts (such as summer curriculum development projects), or even evaluating other teachers as part of performance-based incentive systems that call for peer review. Master teachers may be released from some of their regular instructional duties to perform these special tasks. Because of concerns about taking the best teachers out of their classrooms and disrupting instructional continuity through the use of substitutes, master teachers sometimes are paid for working extra hours to carry out their additional responsibilities.

Master teachers may be the first to be considered for extended (11 or 12 month) contracts, although an extended year is often voluntary. In accepting master teacher status, individuals may become subject to involuntary reassignment to meet district needs. (For example, a master teacher may be transferred to a school having difficulty in attracting good teachers or in which experience and leadership are required.)

* * *

Strengths and Weaknesses... Among the advantages, they can encourage good teachers to stay in teaching by providing advancement opportunities within the profession. Others are: They can counteract stagnation by providing new responsibilities and activities every few years; they may be structured to prevent premature achievement of plateaus; they can link merit, higher pay and increased responsibility. They can help upgrade the school as a teaching and learning environment. Because part of the reward given to superior teachers is enhanced prestige, the monetary requirements of career ladders may be lower than those of alternative incentive plans. And they may be easier for teachers and teachers' organizations to accept than pure merit pay.

Career ladder arrangements pose some potential dangers, however. They may take the best teachers out of the classroom too much of the time. They may disrupt the continuity of instruction by requiring too many scheduling changes and too heavy a reliance on substitutes. In attempting to offer higher levels of responsibility and variety of activity, teachers may be asked to spend time on tasks that are less important than teaching itself. Finally, there is the danger of creating

a new mid-level bureaucracy with responsibilities similar to those of existing mid-level administrators (such as supervisors and subject specialists).

Teaching as a Short-Term Career

To provide attractive opportunities for a larger number of more talented college graduates, to avoid stagnation and burnout, and to lower salary costs, school districts might consider, over the long haul, a more radical restructuring of the teaching profession. Under this approach, most new teachers would be hired to teach no longer than five years. This feature would appeal to many young people who desire to serve society but are not enthusiastic about committing themselves to a 40-year career in teaching.

Entry level salaries would be raised somewhat to make them more competitive and the option of taking cash in place of equal benefits to increase the immediate income of beginning teachers would be offered. The district would also promise to support one year of graduate work or training after five successful years of teaching to assist movement to another occupation.

Teachers who wished to remain after five years would be carefully evaluated. A small percentage of truly outstanding teachers (say 10 percent would be offered very competitive salaries (perhaps giving as high as $50,000 in today's dollars). Satisfactory teachers who wished to remain will be placed on a separate salary schedule more in line with those currently found in most school districts.

Other variations on this option are designed to encourage short-term teaching stints by older persons who have retired early from other jobs and who do not require large salaries and by persons at mid-career in local businesses and industries who wish a temporary change of pace. Special credentialing arrangements might be established for such persons.

Weaknesses. Restructuring teaching to be a short-term career faces several obstacles and drawbacks. The incentives to teach for a few years may be insufficient, and such experience may not be helpful later in obtaining other jobs. Successful implementation of this scheme may result in a shortage of expertise and continuity. A danger of a caste system also arises: the elite, the less prestigious career teachers, and the young short-term teachers. Also, persons who enter teaching for a few years may lack the commitment needed for outstanding performance.

Part-Time and Joint Appointments

Many highly qualified persons are interested in teaching at the elementary or secondary levels but not on a full-time basis. One way in which school districts can expand the pool of teaching talent available to them is to create part-time opportunities for such individuals. (This is usually easier to do at the secondary level and in certain spe-

cialized areas at the elementary level.) Persons who teach part-time may do only that (for example, persons who wish to spend some or most of their time raising their own children), or they may have joint appointments with the school district and with local colleges, universities, businesses, or other organizations.

Strengths and Weaknesses. Joint appointments enable two or more institutions to share the talents of individuals whose help is not needed full-time. They may also provide a measure of prestige to the teachers involved.

Part-time appointments have many attractive attributes, including greater access to larger numbers of highly qualified persons as well as reduced costs. (In addition to avoiding full-time salaries, part-time employees often do not receive the full benefits package.) On the negative side, however, part-time employees often feel less loyal to an organization and may be quicker to leave. Also, it is more difficult to develop strong working relations, shared norms, and esprit de corps among part-time staff members.

Early Retirement

Another way of providing opportunities for energetic young teachers while reducing the number of older teachers who have lost their drive is to make early retirement more attractive. This entails offering a larger percentage of salary as a retirement pension at an earlier age or providing a one-year bonus for retiring.

An early retirement plan requires careful analysis of cost. The funds saved by hiring a beginning teacher at a lower salary can be weighed against the additional retirement cost.

ENHANCED PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

One reason teachers' salaries are lower than those offered to others in comparable professional positions is that teachers are paid for 9 to 10 months of work annually. Thus, while teachers' rates of pay on a monthly or daily basis may be competitive, the total amount earned falls short of salaries received by persons who work 11 or 12 months of the year. For some teachers--such as mothers for whom teaching is a second income and who wish to spend school vacation times with their children--the reduction in total annual salary is acceptable in light of the other benefits to be gained from a shorter work year. However, for growing numbers of teachers and potential teachers (including, particularly, sole or primary income earners) a 9 or 10 month salary is simply too small to live on. Many of these persons are choosing other occupations or leaving teaching, even though they would like to teach.

One response to this problem is to find ways of expanding teachers professional responsibilities so that they can be paid for more hours of work per year. This can be accomplished in several ways.

Master Teachers.

Selected teachers may be designated as master teachers and assigned special responsibilities beyond classroom teaching. Such responsibilities would be similar to those discussed earlier under career ladder plans. The creation of such a cadre can be accomplished without the adoption of an extensive career ladder...

Special Projects.

Teachers can be paid for doing projects beyond regular classroom instruction. Under such arrangements, all teachers would be eligible to submit project proposals describing objectives, intended activities, rationales, and measures to be used in evaluating results. Proposals would be reviewed by school committees, principals, and district committees in order to standardize treatment.

Monetary awards would be given for successful project completion and might vary in size according to project ambitiousness and quality of performance. Quality of past teacher performance (indicated, perhaps, by performance appraisals) might be used as one selection criterion, thereby enabling this approach to help recognize and retain superior teachers without introducing the dangers of pure merit pay.

* * *

Longer School Day or Year.

Teachers can be paid for working more hours per day or more days per year to teach an extra period, advise students and provide remedial assistance, consult with parents, train other teachers, observe and assist other teachers, develop instructional materials, teach summer school, teach under a year around school arrangement, provide supervision, assist cocurricular activities, or perform other professional tasks.

* * *

Strengths and Weaknesses. These schemes to pay teachers more are appealing for several reasons. Some taxpayers will be more supportive if they believe that they are getting more work for their larger investment. Some of these measures can alleviate problems of burnout or stagnation by providing new types of activities for teachers. (At the same time, however, there is also the danger of intensifying burnout if the level of additional responsibility becomes too great or sustained). Finally, by using quality of performance as a criterion, some of these arrangements can reward superior performance in a less visible and controversial way than do pure merit pay schemes.

The greatest danger of expanding teachers' responsibilities to raise pay is that the added duties will be superfluous make-work and a waste of time. Some people believe that there are few important requirements beyond classroom teaching and that even the amount of training needed is limited.

NONMONETARY RECOGNITION

Motivation and recognition for superior effort and performance need not involve large amounts of money, structural changes, or additional responsibilities. Many school districts have long used awards and other low-cost forms of recognition to motivate effort and improvement, to reward outstanding performance and accomplishments, and to increase the likelihood that the best teachers will remain in teaching. Items in this category can include Teacher of the Year awards, PTA-sponsored dinners to express appreciation for teachers, articles about teachers special accomplishments, televised presentations, and even larger awards for major contributions to the state-of-the-art in teaching.

Awards are usually most effective when they are not too few or too many and when used in combination with other types of incentives. If incentives are limited to just a few small awards a year, teachers may come to view them cynically as token replacements for more expensive alternatives. On the other hand, if too many awards are given out, they may lose their prestige and power.

Improved Working Conditions

The conditions in which teachers work support or detract from the teaching-learning process. Facets of teachers working condition that may be improved are almost unlimited; their selection depends on local circumstances, needs, and resources.

In some districts, for example, the physical and social condition of the schools may be so poor that steps to provide a safe, orderly environment must precede anything else. In such districts, the first order of business will be to improve school buildings, strengthen discipline of chronically disorderly students, establish acceptable class sizes and teaching loads, and provide decent textbooks, instructional materials, and equipment.

Other districts will have satisfied these baseline conditions and will be ready to take steps to make teaching a more professional, satisfying, exciting line of work. Such steps can include involving teachers in planning and decision-making, increasing collegiality among teachers, providing more opportunities for discourse on professional matters, and giving teachers more autonomy and perhaps some discretionary funds.

Examples of possible improvements in working conditions capable of helping attract, motivate, and retain teachers include:

1. Providing alternative arrangements for chronic discipline problems.

2. Establishing a more supportive school climate.

3. Increasing teachers' involvement in planning and decision-making.

4. Reducing interruptions of classroom time and announcements, special pull-out programs, and co-curricular activities.

5. Hiring administrative aides (in addition to or instead of instructional aides) to handle routine administrative matters, thereby maximizing the time teachers and principals can devote to instructional matters.

6. Focusing more financial and other resources on support for classroom teaching.

7. Reducing the curriculum fragmentation and crowding that results from continuously adding new topics without dropping others.

8. Improving the balance in class sizes and teaching loads across schools, grade levels, and classrooms.

9. Providing discretionary funds to schools, departments, and/or teachers for supplies, materials, and other instructional expenditures.

10. Providing offices or improved work areas for teachers to use during planning and other noninstructional time.

11. Enhancing school building comfort and appearance.

Strengths and Weaknesses. There are several good reasons for improving working conditions as a form of incentive. As discussed in the preceding chapter, research indicates that intrinsic factors can be highly influential in promoting teacher job satisfaction (given an adequate base salary). Teachers often cite a desire to serve and to work with others as primary reasons for entering the profession. Many of them enter the profession expecting modest salaries and, therefore, consider working conditions more important than money.

Of all the incentives discussed in this chapter, improvements in working conditions are the least threatening to teachers and the most acceptable to teachers' organizations (other than across-the-board salary increases). Finally, school districts with reputations for treating

their teachers well tend to have more success in attracting and retaining good people.

The dangers of focusing on improvements in working conditions are that they will be used as an inexpensive substitute for (rather than supplement to) adequate base salaries; that they will not be considered in tandem with other needed incentives; and that only the lowest-cost options will be used on a token basis, thereby fostering cynicism among teachers.

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

School districts can choose from a wide variety of alternative incentives to improve their abilities to attract and retain good teachers, motivate teachers, and accomplish other community goals. The options vary considerably in their character, scope, magnitude, cost, purpose, and potential effectiveness. While the strengths and weaknesses of incentives will vary according to school districts, circumstances and how the incentives are structured to particular cases, some summary observations can be made.

* * *

Significant differences among the plans are worth highlighting. Bonus plans, for example, provide for monetary rewards each year, rewards which may be given for flexible and specific purposes without a multi-year commitment of salary or retirement benefits. Thus, a bonus plan is particularly useful in attracting specific kinds of new teachers to a district. For those currently in the district, there will be both positive and negative incentives in the rewards given each year, with some resulting morale problems. Performance-based salary plans will have similar advantages and disadvantages

Career ladder and master teacher plans involve longer-term choices and add the recognition of a new title and position to the monetary reward. Consequently, they may provide a more powerful incentive, but one that will focus on teachers already in the district and less directly on attracting new teachers since the monetary reward would be deferred.

Many of the plans are costly. The specific monetary reward for an individual should probably be 2 to 5 percent of annual salary, if not higher. The overall cost to the district will vary depending on both the individual reward and the number of individuals receiving a reward. A critical factor in any incentive plan is the percentage of those eligible who receive a reward. For bonus plans, total cost may be kept low by limiting the subgroup eligible to receive a reward. For career ladder plans, the subgroup can be limited by the number of years an individual teacher must be in the district before becoming eligible. Perform-

ance-based pay plans, however, would consider all teachers eligible; thus, the total cost would depend on the size of individual rewards and the percentage of teachers receiving rewards.

The plans vary also in their use of performance appraisal. Career ladder plans generally include a screening process that is multi-year, multi-faceted, and distinct from the annual performance appraisal process. There is some opportunity with the longer term screening to involve teachers in the process. Bonus for performance and performance-based salary plans generally require annual appraisal with the associated teacher apprehension about the fairness an objectivity of the process.

* * *

The two major types of resources that may be required by incentive plans are funds and staff time. The range of resource requirements is broad across incentive categories. Improvements in working conditions will require low or medium levels of financial support (enhanced administrative support of teachers may cost nothing, but school building improvements are likely to cost more) and relatively small amounts of staff time (compared to that required by other incentives). Performance-based salary increases will require medium to high amounts of additional funds (depending on he number and size of salary increases) and will require large amounts of staff time for performance appraisal and administration.

CHAPTER 4

THE TOLEDO PLAN

Terry L. Wyatt and Eileen Burch
Toledo Public Schools

Treat people as if they were what they ought to be and
you help them to become what they are capable of being.
--Goethe

Certainly, the decisions we make regarding the performance of teachers has more to do with school improvement than any other factor. And certainly, before one can make the quantum leap from "what one is" to "what one is capable of being," an effective system of evaluation needs to be internalized. In the case of schools, it must be internalized by both teachers and administrators.

The purpose of this chapter is to share such a system which has evolved as the Toledo Plan. This chapter is divided into two sections. Section One delineates the process involved in the supervising of first-year teacher interns. Section Two details the assistance provided to veteran teachers whose effectiveness in the classroom has been determined unsatisfactory.

Teacher Intern Program

In 1984, the Rand Corporation's Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession published a document based upon an examination of the important elements of a sound teacher evaluation system. Under the direction of Arthur Wise and its co-authors, the document identified four school districts operating effective teacher evaluation programs. Highlighted as one of the school districts performing valid reliable and helpful supervision was Toledo Public Schools, Ohio. Toledo did not arrive at this level of distinction overnight.

The notion of an Intern Program first emerged in 1973 as part of a union collective bargaining demand. The program was to be a vehicle by which members of the Toledo Federation of Teachers would take an active role in the professional development of new teachers in Toledo Public Schools. The demand was rejected in 1973 and again on two other occasions. Finally, in 1980, school management and the union came to agreement on an intern program. This agreement was contingent upon the union's acceptance of a systematic plan for termination of those teachers who were identified as grossly ineffective.

In its first few years, the program was viewed with a great deal of skepticism and opposition by both principals and teachers. Many principals expressed the fear of losing control of their buildings. Teachers feared that the intervention phase would be misused as a

witch hunt perpetrated against those who had fallen out of favor with the administration. Changes in the intern program have come about, however, through critiques made by consulting teachers and interns at the close of each year. Now in its sixth year, the program enjoys the overall support of the administration as well as that of the teachers in the district.

Consulting teachers. The intern paradigm is quite simple. The nucleus of the program is a cadre of consulting teachers who have been selected for their excellence in teaching, leadership abilities and human relations skills. These individuals have been chosen to serve three-year appointments, receiving their regular teacher salaries plus an additional three thousand dollars to compensate for the increased responsibilities they assume. At the conclusion of this period, consulting teachers are returned to their original teaching positions.

Consultant positions are open to any teacher in the system who has had five successful years of teaching and can provide five supporting references, one each from union building representative, and principal and three from other teachers in the building. Final selection of consultants is made jointly by the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel and the TFT president. During the first year of the program, there were seventy-five applicants for fifteen consultant positions.

Consulting teachers are called into service depending upon need. Need is determined by: (1) the number of first-year teachers hired into the system and (2) the number of identified senior teachers experiencing difficulty in the classroom. (The latter is discussed in the second part of this chapter.) Consultants are assigned 8-10 interns and possibly 1-2 interventions according to the grade level or subject area of the professionals they will be assisting.

As mentor to the new intern teacher, the consultant is responsible for facilitating professional development, providing support, and giving advice and direction aimed at helping the intern achieve success. The intern program was not designed to be an extension of college training, a "fifth year." It is an on-the-job learning experience. Interns receive one-year contracts, pay one half union dues and have limited representation by the union.

Evaluation Process. The process of evaluating interns is very formal and begins with a preliminary conference. The purposes of the conference are to explain the objectives and design of the program and to introduce the intern to a cycle of observation, goal-setting, conference and growth. From an initial observation of the intern's teaching strategies and techniques, the consultant is able to determine areas which need improvement. Within five days after the observation the consultant must develop and share with the intern a systematic plan for professional and personal improvement. Suggestions such as strategies for the improvement of classroom management may be discussed. It is the obligation of the consultant to offer concrete suggestions and resources designed to help the intern carry out the plan.

After a reasonable period of time, intern progress is checked. New goals are established or previous ones modified. The process is repeated throughout the intern year. This process is carefully documented and a report of it submitted to a Review Panel as evidence to support a summary evaluation.

The summary evaluation is divided into four major areas: (1) Teaching Procedures, (2) Classroom Management, (3) Knowledge of Subject Matter and (4) Personal Characteristics and Professional Responsibility. "Outstanding," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory" are used to rate the intern's performance on the summary evaluation. The report is then presented to the Review Panel, a governing body composed of four school administration and five union appointees. It is the responsibility of the governing board to monitor and evaluate the work of the consulting teachers. The integrity and reliability of the program is preserved by the careful scrutiny given to each report. In an effort to determine the validity of the summary evaluation, consultants are thoroughly cross-examined about their observations, suggestions and evaluations. After accepting or rejecting the consultant's recommendations, the final evaluations are forwarded by the Review Panel to the Superintendent for submission to the school board.

Intervention Program

Intervention is designed to address the problems of the veteran teacher experiencing great difficulty in the classroom. Specifically, intervention is a cooperative union and management program for a non-probationary teacher whose performance is so unsatisfactory that improvement or termination is imperative. It is not designed for the marginal teacher. During intervention, an experienced teacher-consultant works with a severely troubled colleague in an effort to raise classroom performance to a satisfactory level. Intervention is not a voluntary process. Once initiated, a teacher must accept the help of the consultant or face official action by the school district's Personnel Office.

The process used to identify and assign a teacher to the Intervention Program has been made deliberately slow in order to safeguard the due process rights of tenured teachers. The process can be initiated by union or management but can only continue if there is union and management concurrence. One side can veto the other and, unless both parties agree that a teacher can benefit from the help of a consultant, intervention is not authorized.

The identification process may begin when a teacher representative in the school contacts the union president to outline a problem. Any principal who wishes to initiate the process contacts the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel. Once the contact has been made in either case, a union representative and the Personnel Office discuss the possibility of intervention. Both parties must agree that the best interests of all concerned will be served by Intervention.

There are other support programs available to teachers in the Toledo Public Schools. If, in the identification process, it is determined that the needs of an individual would be better served by referral to one of these programs, then that is what is done. For example, if it were discovered that a problem is chemical dependency, emotional or psychological distress or financial difficulty, the case would likely be referred to the Employee Assistance Program. Likewise, if a teacher being considered for Intervention desired professional educational assistance, referral would be to the School Consultation Program, a confidential and voluntary assistance program for Toledo teachers.

Once management and union officials are convinced that the situation requires Intervention, they then authorize an informal meeting between the school principal and the building representative. At this first meeting, one side informs the other about the nature of the problem. This informal meeting is followed by a formal meeting where, if the principal and a majority of the union's building committee agree, Intervention is authorized. Once the decision to intervene is reached, the identified teacher receives a letter from the Office of Personnel listing identified inadequacies and the name of the consulting teacher assigned.

Intervention does not happen without the prior knowledge of the troubled teacher. In reality, an Intervention candidate has experienced problems over a long period of time. Complaints from students and parents and numerous attempts at help from colleague have preceded the referral. Intervention occurs because all attempts have been ignored or failed.

After being notified of placement in Intervention, the teacher may appeal the placement to an impartial arbitrator. The arbitrator does not evaluate the classroom performance of the teacher, but reviews the placement procedures to determine whether or not assignment to Intervention has been appropriate. The decision of the arbitrator is binding on the teacher, the administration, and the union.

If the challenge to Intervention is denied, the assigned consultant has a set procedure to follow. A consultant is required to hold entry and exit meetings with the principal and building representative. During the entry meeting, the consultant asks questions about the problems outlined on the referral form and gives information about the types of assistance that will be provided. At the conclusion of the Intervention, the consultant will again meet with these two parties and outlines the services provided, describes the procedures used to raise classroom performance, and the teacher's progress. These meetings are designed to keep the building personnel apprised of the work done during the months of assistance.

The actual work of the consultant is not bound by set procedures. For example, the consultant works without time restraints. The problems encountered are often the result of years of bad habits, and it is unrealistic to expect immediate solutions. It also requires time to establish the rapport and trust needed to convince a troubled col-

league that the consultant is supportive and that the goal of Intervention is to raise performance to an acceptable level. This conviction also requires that consultants have well developed listening and other communication skills.

Equally important is that the uniqueness of each case requires that the consultant not use set methods to improve teaching effectiveness. Each Intervention could include detailed classroom observations, demonstration lessons, videotape analysis, lesson plan writing, classroom management strategy development, or observation of other peers. The consultant has the entire resources of the school system to use in providing help to the troubled colleague.

Intervention ends when the consultant determines that assistance is no longer needed. It may be that classroom performance has been raised to a satisfactory level, that the individual can no longer benefit from the service, or that the Intervention has been unsuccessful. The conclusion of an Intervention mandates that a confidential status report be submitted to the school personnel and union offices. If the teacher in Intervention holds a one-year contract he or she is evaluated as an Intern, using the summary evaluation form. If he or she holds a four-year contract, and it is time for that to be evaluated, the four year evaluation form is used. A teacher not scheduled for a formal contract evaluation (the majority of cases) receives a narrative statement outlining all of the details of the Intervention process.

Once the Status Report has been filed with the school and union offices, it becomes the responsibility of management to act upon or to ignore the report. If the Toledo Schools administration initiates termination proceedings against the teacher, and if the teacher requests union representation, the Toledo Federation processes the action according to its internal grievance guidelines, and each case is reviewed on its own merits.

The benefits of Intervention are numerous. The experienced teachers receives practical help from experienced peers. Teachers demonstrate that incompetence will not be tolerated and that they are willing to take responsibility for policing their own ranks. The wide acceptance of both programs by teachers, administrators and the public has shown that it is a valuable tool in insuring quality instruction and furthering the growth of teaching as a profession.

CHAPTER 5

TENNESSEE'S CAREER LADDER FOR TEACHERS

Barbara G. Burch
Memphis State University

The Comprehensive Education Reform Act, which was signed into law by Governor Lamar Alexander on March 6, 1984, has been referred to as perhaps the nation's most ambitious statewide teacher career ladder and incentive pay program. This program was developed out of the frustration of operating under a system in which the best teachers are not paid more than the poorest teachers. As a result, too many excellent teachers are being forced to abandon what they enjoy doing and do well--teaching children--and to pursue other career opportunities where they can make more money so that they can provide a better future for their own families. The Tennessee Career Ladder Plan is an incentive pay system that was designed to make teaching a truly professional career, to encourage the brightest and best young people to come into teaching, and to challenge the best teachers to do even better by rewarding excellence in teaching.

Early Stages of Development

The career ladder program for teachers in Tennessee was first proposed as the Master Teacher Program by Governor Lamar Alexander in January, 1983. At that time, the program included four career stages which would allow upward mobility to a higher career level every five years. While the Master Teacher Program was originally part of a comprehensive Better Schools Program, Governor Alexander described the career ladder segment of the plan as the most important proposal he expected to make while in the governor's office. The proposal encountered considerable opposition from the state teacher's association, and several compromise versions were proposed in order to secure critical support for the career ladder program. However, this was not accomplished, and the program was deferred for a year for study by a special legislative commission known as the Select Committee on Education. The Select Committee on Education was composed of seven senators and seven representatives, grouped into three subcommittees.

During the year of study, the Governor vigorously worked to develop the program that was to become legislation in 1984. Commissions were appointed to study and develop the program, and a massive publicity campaign was mounted as teachers, lay persons, and organizations that would be affected by the new program were involved. An *Ad Hoc* Interim Certification Commission was appointed to develop the new program. A central control office in the State Department of Education was created and staff were assigned to devote full-time to the development of the program. As a result, by 1984, the general mood of various constituencies throughout the State indicated that the public was ready to support some type of major education reform.

The state teacher's association raised a number of key issues which became part of the deliberations of the Select Committee as negotiations continued to develop a plan which would gain acceptance. The primary issues raised by the teacher's association included the inadequacies of the base salary for teachers in Tennessee, the need to avoid having quotas placed on the number of teachers who could be acknowledged under a career ladder system, the need for the state to assume responsibility for securing the necessary funding for such a program, the need to establish objectives for evaluating outstanding teacher performance and to assure that favoritism does not enter into the evaluation process, and the need for teachers and administrators to take an integral part in developing and implementing the program.

Governor Alexander's Career Ladder Plan was widely discussed and debated throughout the state during 1983. At the end of 1983, the Governor announced plans to convene a special legislative session in January, 1984, which was devoted exclusively to the topic of education reform and ways to finance it. The education reform package was debated for six weeks before agreement was reached on the final version.

Career Ladder Levels for Teachers

The final version of the career ladder for teachers included five steps, with annual salary incentives for Tennessee's 46,000 eligible teachers ranging from $500 for those qualifying as Apprentice teachers to $7000 for teachers at the highest level of the ladder who work a twelve-month contract. The five certificate levels of the Tennessee Career Ladder are as follows:

Probationary. This certificate is for first-year teachers who have completed an approved college teacher preparation program and meet the minimum qualifying score on the National Teacher Examination. This is a non-renewable certificate.

Apprentice. This certificate is awarded to those teachers who receive a positive evaluation from the local school system and successfully complete the probationary year. Teachers at this level receive an annual incentive supplement of $500. The certificate is valid for three years and is nonrenewable. During each of these years, the teacher is evaluated by the local system, with the state also conducting an evaluation during the third year. At that time, teachers must receive tenure and move to the next level, or they cannot be rehired.

Career Level I. This certificate is awarded for five years and is renewable. It is accompanied by a $1000. salary supplement. Teachers at this level must be evaluated at least twice during the five-year period,

and the state conducts an evaluation during the fifth year. Teachers with only a bachelor's degree are also required to complete one upper level academic course with a 3.0 grade point average during the five-year period. Teachers at this level may supervise student interns and probationary teachers.

Career Level II. This certificate level is attained after completing at least one Career Level I five-year period, meeting the requirements of the state evaluation system and attaining the minimum qualifying score for Career Level II. This certificate is valid for five years and is renewable. At this level, teachers are evaluated at least twice during a five year period by the state. Career Level II teachers may receive state salary supplements of either $2000 or $4000, depending upon whether they elect a ten- or eleven-month contract. Teachers at this level may be assigned, in addition to regular duties, to work with gifted or remedial students, with special needs students, or to assist Apprentice level teachers.

Career Level III. This level is awarded after completion of at least one Career Level II five-year period and after meeting the requirements of the state evaluation system. This certificate is renewable upon completing course requirements listed for Career Level I and upon meeting evaluation standards. Teachers at this level may elect ten-, eleven-, or twelve-month contracts for which they will receive, respectively, state supplements of $3000, $5000, or $7000. Teachers at this level may be assigned to work with remedial or gifted students, with special needs students, or to assist Apprentice and Career Level I teachers.

Fast-Track Option

During the first year of the Career Ladder Program, all eligible teachers were encouraged to enter, and a number of different ways to qualify were provided. These were called "fast-track" options, and they were available only during the first year. After that time, a teacher entering the program would be required to complete the full evaluation process. Five fast-track options made available for teachers with three or more years experience are as follows:

1. Attain specified cut-off scores on the NTE core battery in the areas of communication skills, general knowledge, and professional knowledge, along with a recommendation from the local school system.

2. Attain specified cut-off scores on NTE specialty area exams, along with a recommendation from the local school system.

3. Achieve passing scores on the Tennessee Career Ladder Test which includes three subsections: Reading Skills, Writing Skills, and Professional Skills.

4. Complete 40 hours of instruction and an end-of-program evaluation in either a state approved local career ladder staff development program or in the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM).

5. Meet the requirements of a state approved local evaluation plan or the state model for local evaluation.

Public school teachers with at least eight years experience were eligible to apply for the Career Level I or II certificate, while teachers with 12 years experience could apply for Career Level I, II, or III certificates. Current teachers who chose not to enter a career ladder were allowed to stay under the present system with its ten- year recertification procedures. Presently employed teachers were also allowed to use the "toe-in-the water" provision for trying the new system, but they could return to the former certification system if they chose to do so.

The Evaluation Process

The legislation for the Tennessee Career Ladder Program called for specific evaluation criteria which included classroom observation, review of evaluations conducted in the local school systems, personal interview, and examination of inservice and professional development activities. The observation process includes evaluation teams, multiple visits, pre- and post-observation conferences, and an opportunity for teachers to request limited changes in evaluation team membership.

All Career Level I teachers are evaluated according to the following procedures:

1. A pre-evaluation interview including identification of performance goals for the teacher.

2. Multiple observations in a variety of teaching situations.

3. Review of indicators of student progress, where applicable.

4. A formal written evaluation and the performance criteria.

5. A post-evaluation interview in which the specific results of the evaluation are discussed with the teacher.

6. An opportunity for the teacher to respond in writing to the written evaluation.

Local systems are responsible for evaluating applicants at Career Level I and below, using state approved evaluation procedures. The criteria for evaluation of Career Levels II and III are the same as for Career Level I except that the classroom observations are done by a team of state trained evaluators. These evaluators will be selected from Level III teachers and Level II principals or supervisors from outside the school system of the teacher being evaluated. Also, at Career Levels II and III, the review of evaluations will be completed by principals, supervisors, and others in authority positions.

Areas of Competence

The Tennessee Career Ladder evaluation system is designed to evaluate teaching skills and knowledge. Both educational research and information from teachers across the state were used to identify criterion skills and knowledge. The skills and knowledge of effective teaching were incorporated into the evaluation system as it was developed. Six basic domains of competence are evaluated:

1. Planning for Instruction.
2. Delivery of Instruction (Teaching Strategy).
3. Evaluation of Student Progress.
4. Classroom Management.
5. Professional Leadership.
6. Basic Communication Skills.

For each of these competence domains, performance indicators are provided. The competencies and indicators are assessed in a variety of ways which include classroom observation, teacher portfolio, applicant interview, principal interview, peer questionnaire, student questionnaire, and written tests. The evaluation competencies and indicators are shown in Figure 1.

Assumptions on Which Program Was Developed

The Tennessee Career Ladder evaluation system may be better understood when the assumptions and principles upon which the system was constructed are made clear. Following are the stated assumptions

Figure 1. Teacher Competencies and Indicators.

I = Classroom Observation
II = Portfolio
III = Applicant Interview
IV = Principal Interview
V = Peer Questionnaire
VI = Student Questionnaire
VII = Written Test

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
I. Prepares for instruction effectively.							
A. Establishes appropriate instructional goals and related objectives consistent with the curriculum.		X	X	X			
B. Prepares instructional plans and materials incorporating principles of effective instruction.	X	X	X	X			X
C. Creates, selects or modifies instructional plans and materials to accommodate learner instructional levels.	X	X	X	X			X
II. Uses teaching strategies and procedures appropriate to the content, objectives, and learners.							
A. Provides a clear description of the learning task and its content.	X	X				X	
B. Monitors learner understanding and reteaches as necessary.	X	X	X			X	
C. Provides learners appropriate practice and review.	X	X	X			X	
D. Establishes and maintains learner involvement in the learning task.	X	X	X			X	
III. Uses evaluation to improve instruction.							
A. Uses information about learner performance to improve the instructional process.		X	X	X			X
B. Reports learner status and progress to learners and their parents.	X	X	X	X		X	
IV. Manages classroom activities effectively.							
A. Establishes and maintains appropriate learner behavior.	X	X		X		X	X
B. Establishes and maintains a classroom climate conducive to learning.	X	X	X	X		X	X
C. Makes effective use of classroom resources (e.g. personnel, time, materials, facilities).	X		X	X		X	

Figure 1. Teacher Competencies and Indicators (cont.).

I = Classroom Observation
II = Portfolio
III = Applicant Interview
IV = Principal Interview
V = Peer Questionnaire
VI = Student Questionnaire
VII = Written Test

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
V. Establishes and maintains a professional leadership role.							
A. Improves professional skills and knowledge.		X	X	X			
B. Takes a leadership role in improving education.		X	X	X	X		
C. (Screening only) Performs professional responsibilities efficiently.			X	X	X		
VI. (Screening only) Communicates effectively.							
A. Writes clearly and correctly.	X					X	X
B. Communicates oral information effectively.	X		X	X		X	
C. Reads professionally relevant literature/materials with comprehension.		X	X	X			

about the evaluation program, teachers, evaluators, evaluation processes and procedures, and the evaluation instruments as outlined in the Teacher Orientation Manual:

The Program

1. The primary goal of the evaluation program is to identify and reward outstanding teaching performance.

2. a second important goal of the evaluation program is instructional improvement.

3. A sound evaluation program focuses on performance rather than credentials.

4. To be most useful, the evaluation program must be coupled with a strong professional development program.

The Teacher

1. The teacher wants to be a competent professional.

2. Instruction is the primary element in the overall role of the teacher.

3. It is possible to assess differences in teacher performance.

4. The skills needed and manifested by outstanding teachers are not different in kind from those needed and manifested by less able teachers.

5. Most, if not all, teachers can improve performance.

The Evaluator

1. Teachers are best able to evaluate the performance of their peers.

2. Rigorous training is essential to the development of an evaluator.

3. Evaluation is best conducted by a team of evaluators rather than a single individual.

4. The evaluator must have a commitment to instructional improvement.

The Process

1. The evaluation process should not discourage diversity in teaching behavior.

2. Multiple observations of teaching are necessary to obtain a reliable picture of teaching behavior.

3. Effectiveness of teaching behavior must be assessed in light of learner, school and/or system characteristics, needs and organizational structures.

4. The evaluation process should focus on the identification of patterns of teaching behavior.

5. Multiple sources of data are essential to the development of a complete picture of teaching performance.

The Evaluation Instruments

1. The evaluation instrument(s) must be developed from the evaluation process.

2. the instrument(s) must be understood by all teachers and administrators.

3. The instrument(s) must assess the performance of competencies/skills deemed important to effective teaching.

4. Checklists and rating scales are useful only as reflections of summarized information.

The passage of the education reform package in Tennessee went well beyond the Career Ladder Program for teachers in its scope. The package included other significant provisions. One of these was a career ladder program for principals and supervisors and other school personnel. There were also provisions for a principal-administrator academy and for additional teacher training. As a result, extensive improvements are expected to occur in Tennessee's education system, some of which are a direct result of the career ladder: (1) a fifty percent re-education in the number of teachers who leave the teaching profession because of job dissatisfaction, (2) elimination of waivers for teaching outside one's area of certification and (3) a higher quality of people entering the teaching profession.

Responses to the Tennessee Career Ladder Program have included praise, fear, hope, concern, resentment, excitement, criticism, and

renewed commitment. There are still many bugs to be worked out of the system, which is an inevitability in any such major change. There has been much concern over the amount of paperwork associated with the system, and efforts are being made to reduce this. There are also concerns about the amount of time spent evaluating teachers. Some teachers have expressed apprehension that the distinction imposed by the career ladder levels may foster unhealthy competition and restrict the level of professional sharing and cooperation which should exist among teachers in schools.

At this point in time, educators at all levels throughout the state are working to implement the Tennessee Career Ladder program. A new Sate Certification Commission is now in place which will set policies and provide the monitoring and decision-making so critical to the success of the program. Regional Certification Committees have recently been appointed in the State as a way of extending the implementation responsibilities for the program. Personnel at the state level have made continuous attempts to address critical issues which have been raised and are working with local systems to provide the technical assistance needed for full implementation.

There is no question that there is more going on now to improve the quality of public education in Tennessee than at any time in the state's history. Governor Alexander has repeatedly stated that we need better schools if our achievements are going to match the ambitions we have for ourselves. Better schools demand excellent teachers. The next several years will be critical in determining the extent to which the Tennessee Career Ladder for teachers has created sufficient incentives to keep our excellent teachers in teaching, and to attract additional well-qualified individuals into the profession of teaching in Tennessee.

CHAPTER 6

A LOCALLY DEVELOPED CAREER LADDER

Ralph J. Haws and L. Ray Brown
Jordan School District, Sandy, Utah

Jordan School District is located 15 miles south of metropolitan Salt Lake City. The school district has a student population of 60,000, and it is now the second largest district in the State of Utah. In recent years, the district has been hiring approximately 300 new teachers annually. The need for attracting and holding qualified, competent teachers has been very real.

Studies of American education by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) and other national and local groups have identified an urgent need to explore alternatives related to developing a variety of incentive structures for teachers. In December of 1983, the Jordan School District made application to the United States Department of Education for a planning grant from the Secretary's Discretionary Fund. The grant would provide financial support for an initial effort to develop incentive structures for the District.

The main goals of the planning grant were to develop a three- or four-step career ladder, including a performance evaluation system designed to assess teacher competencies and to identify superior teachers.

In March of 1984, while the planning grant application was being reviewed by USDOE, the Utah Legislature mandated a career ladder program in every school district in the state. The programs were to be in place by July 1, 1984. Because the legislative mandate required each school district to submit a career ladder plan to the State Board of Education by May 15, 1985, it was necessary for the district to begin development of a career ladder plan without the resources that would have been provided by the planning grant. Unfortunately, the imposed time constraints precluded the broad teacher participation in the development of the plan that might otherwise have been the case.

Because of the short timeline, the Year One Plan was basically developed by a district career ladder steering committee composed of three parents, three teachers and three administrators. The Year One Plan was funded at a level of $2,174,000 and included three components:

1. Extended Day.

   Provided three additional contract days for all teaching personnel to be used for such activities as grade preparation, preparation for parent teacher conferences and meeting with parents to develop student education plans ($824,000).

2. Pilot Program.

Allowed for one elementary school, one middle school and one high school to apply for career ladder monies to initiate their own pilot programs designed to recognize excellence in education by utilizing alternative teacher incentive structures ($150,000).

3. Career Ladder.

Provided for a four-step career ladder including Level I Provisional Teacher, Level II Professional Teacher, Level III Senior Teacher, and Level IV Teacher Leader.

After a teacher has satisfactorily completed provisional status, he/she could then apply for professional teacher status and, subsequently, for either senior teacher or teacher leader status. The senior teacher could qualify for an additional salary based on a point system with each point having a monetary value of $50. Senior teachers could earn points in the following ways:

1)	Selection to be a Senior Teacher	2 points
2)	Educator projects involving direct service to students	1-6 points
3)	Student productivity projects designed to improve student achievement, content mastery, comprehension or skill development in specific areas	1 point
4)	Team leader or department head	1 point
5)	Curriculum development activities	1 point
6)	Increased classload	1-2 points
7)	Special school needs	1 point
8)	Educator participation toward accomplishing school goals	1-2 points
9)	Participation in student evaluation of teaching activities	1 point
10)	Community involvement of teachers	1 point
11)	Principal evaluation required for all senior teachers	2 points

Forty-eight percent or 1,141 of the teachers qualified for senior teacher status at a cost of $686,000.

Teacher leaders were identified as skilled teachers who instruct and lead other teachers. They stimulate improvement in the quality of teaching through modeling, coaching, and strengthening the instructional skills of other teachers. Local schools qualified for teacher leaders on the basis of one teacher leader per 200 students.

The rate of reimbursement would be $1,800 to each teacher selected as a teacher leader with the understanding that 40 hours outside of contract time under the direction of the building administrator would be expected.

Eleven percent or 265 teachers qualified as teacher leader at a cost of $477,000.

This locally developed career ladder-teacher incentive program was implemented September 1, 1984. Jordan District is no different than most local school districts throughout the country. Teachers were hesitant about the concept of a career ladder, skeptical about any program of monetary incentives based on performance, and they were generally slow to accept the change. As the Year One Plan was implemented, it became immediately clear that there were at least two major problems associated with the plan:

1. Lack of ownership on the part of teachers, attributable to their minimum input in development of the plan.

2. The necessity of quotas in teacher leader positions due to insufficient funds, a problem that resulted in ten formal grievances for nonselection.

If the program were to be more successful, it was obvious that some significant changes must be reflected in the Year Two Plan. In order to provide the District Career Ladder Steering Committee with a data base that could be utilized in modifying the Year Two Plan, a decision was made to approach the U.S. Office of Education with a recommendation that the focus of the planning grant which had been awarded be changed from development to evaluation.

In January of 1985, a work statement outlining the activities and timeline that would be followed in obtaining a data base for improving the design of the Career Ladder was approved. At this time, it was also decided that a Third Party Evaluation Team would be retained with monies from the grant to assist the Jordan School District in evaluation of the Year One Career Ladder being implemented during the 1984-85 School Year. The purpose of the evaluation was to obtain information for improving the design and operation of the Year Two Plan.

Experience and opinions of district principals and teachers regarding the program would be the main source of information for the first part of the evaluation. The second part of the evaluation would engage teachers from the district's respective schools to review the data and make recommendations for the Year Two Plan. Both of these activities proved to be extremely helpful in the modification and implementation of the Year Two Plan.

An analysis of the data and findings of the Third Party Evaluation resulted in eleven major conclusions and nine recommendations.* It was obvious that three of the conclusions and two of the recommenda-

* A complete text of the evaluation, its conclusions and recommendations may be obtained by writing Dr. Ralph J. Haws, Jordan School District, 9361 South 300 East, Sandy, Utah 84070. An Executive Summary, also available from Dr. Haws, details the Year Two Plan and describes additional evaluation data and conclusions.

tions, in particular, must be addressed if the Career Ladder were to become a viable program in the district. The three conclusions indicated that:

1. Inconsistencies with respect to application requirements in the teacher leader selection process, and differences in the expectations and pay of teacher leaders and senior teachers, resulted in significant negative attitudes toward the overall program.

2. Generally, teachers felt that the whole concept of career ladders was not well defined. The absence of teacher involvement resulted in a lack of program credibility.

3. Although teachers did not particularly like the career ladder concept, they were willing to "endure it" because of the extra money involved.

Among the more important recommendations that were made were:

1. The quotas for teacher leaders must be eliminated and the distinction between teacher leader and senior teachers should be clarified.

2. Selection criteria must be more carefully defined and any bias related to selection and placement on the ladder must be minimized.

After a careful review by the Career Ladder Steering Committee, these data were then made available to a representative group of educators who spent three days reviewing the conclusions and recommendations which resulted in some consensus recommendations as to the modifications that should be reflected in the Year Two Plan that would be implemented in September 1985. This broad teacher input proved to be the most critical strategy utilized by the District in changing the attitudes and feelings about the Career Ladder Program.

Based on data from the third Party Evaluation and the teacher educator input, the Year Two Plan was modified and included at least six significant components:

1. Extended Days.

   Three additional contract days included at the end of the first, second and third quarters would be made available to all certificated educators. The planning for the activities on these days was under the direction of the principal or the immediate supervisor and could be used for such areas Core Curriculum planning, preparation for parent-teacher conferences or development of student education plans.

2. Optional Flexible Day.

   One additional day before, after, or during the school year was made available on a school application basis. Applications must be

approved by the local school Career Ladder Committee and submitted for approval through the District Committee. This additional day could be used for such activities as curriculum development, working on local school goals and community outreach activities and preparation for parent-teacher conferences. This eight hour time period could be broken into segments depending on local school needs and approved plans.

3. Career Ladder Vertical Dimensions.

The career levels component provided for differentiated staffing for certificated teachers. It was basically the same as the Year One Plan but eliminated the designation of teacher leader and senior teacher utilizing a simple Level I, II, III, and IV designation. Teachers could apply for points from a menu of special activities (see listing above). Selection of the activities and points was made by the individual teacher and submitted to the local School Steering Committee for approval. A Level I Teacher could apply for 10 points, a Level II Teacher could apply for 10 points and a Level III or IV Teacher could apply for 20 points from the menu.

4. Performance Evaluation.

This component provided an additional 10 points for each teacher based on a comprehensive performance evaluation. The number of performance evaluation points awarded would be determined by three general lines of evidence.

a) An administrative performance evaluation conducted by the principal or immediate supervisor. This performance evaluation was worth 0-5 points. Each Level IV Teacher must receive a rating of three points or above on all scales of the Jordan Improving Teacher Competency Scale to be considered for additional performance evaluation points.

b) After receiving at least three points on each item of the Scale, Level IV Teachers could qualify for an additional three points by submitting a professional development plan based on an individual self-evaluation.

c) Level IV Teachers could qualify for an additional one or two points by submitting optional lines of evidence. These lines of evidence could be generated by peer review, student surveys or parent surveys.

5. Menu of Special Activities.

This menu was the primary vehicle by which teachers received remuneration from the Career Ladder Plan. The menu recognized the need for reimbursing teachers for superior performance while, at the same time, providing alternatives for receiving remuneration for extra work and special projects. The menu was eventually broken down into 22 distinct activities that could be selected by a

teacher and included for submission to the local School Steering Committee.

6. Local School Career Ladder Steering Committee.

Each school was required to organize a Local School Career Ladder Steering Committee composed of at least two teachers, two parents and one administrator. Teachers serving on these committees must be elected by the respective school staffs, would serve for one year and would be awarded career ladder points from the menu of special activities. The responsibility of the local school committee included assisting the school principal in developing the school goals at the beginning of the school year, reviewing and approving each teacher's plan for accruing points from the Career Ladder Menu, monitor attendance and involvement in the Optional/Extended Day activities, approve the local school plan for utilization of the Optional/Extended Days and submit recommendations to the District Career Ladder Steering Committee for adding additional activities to the Career Ladder Menu.

7. Career Ladder Appeal Procedure.

As a result of formal grievances filed during Year One, it was decided to modify the appeals procedure so that most issues could be resolved at the local school level. The appeals procedure guaranteed each teacher the right to appeal any decisions related to placement and/or the awarding of points from the Career Ladder Menu to the Local School Career Ladder Steering Committee.

Space restrictions will not allow the sharing of more details of the Year Two Plan and the successes that resulted from the evaluation and broader teacher input.

In summary, the Year Two Career Ladder Program was well received by the majority of teachers. Data related to perceived fairness and effectiveness of the Year Two Plan significantly improved over the Year One Plan. It is important to note that data from the Third Party Evaluation of the Year Two Plan will again be utilized by a representative group of educators and the District Career Ladder Steering Committee in developing the Year Three Plan. The 1986 Legislature gave the Career Ladder Program a strong vote of confidence by adding an additional $5,000,000 to the overall state program. Jordan School District now has a more adequate funding level and additional time to further develop, implement and refine its Year Three Plan. The Legislature had the wisdom to keep the guidelines rather broad, allowing local districts to develop and refine plans based on local needs and circumstances.

The Career Ladder in Jordan District has proven to be a very successful activity. While evaluation would suggest that modifications will probably continue to be made, teachers feel that significant gains were made in the Year Two Plan. It is anticipated that the Career Ladder be utilized as a significant tool in improving the quality of education for students while, at the same time, rewarding teachers for superior performances with their students.

CHAPTER 7

USING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTERS AND CAREER LADDERS TO REDESIGN THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Roy A. Edelfelt
Edelfelt Johnson Consultants

Very few people inside or outside education regard teachers as professionals. Teaching is not seen as intellectually demanding or technically sophisticated. Teachers are seldom consulted about philosophy, policy, or even procedures in determining school matters. Teachers are simply not valued, and they know it. This lack of professional regard is a deep-seated problem that will not go away until educators acknowledge it openly and develop some ways to deal with it. The problem affects teachers, supervisors, administrators, staff developers, higher education people, and the public. Until school personnel, teachers and administrators, take teaching seriously, say so, and behave accordingly, no one else is going to.

One way to address the problem is to redesign teaching to ensure that it is a profession. Among other things, this means linking preparation, ability, responsibility, and rewards. It means that professional development becomes an integral and continuous part of a teacher's career. It means providing career patterns in teaching.

Redesign has several cogent arguments to recommend it. Teaching today requires a team effort. A school faculty should be that team. Admittedly, all members of the team are not equal in preparation, ability, or experience. Some want and can manage more responsibility than others. Others need help in realizing the number and the complexity of tasks they can handle. If a teaching career is to be a continuous growing experience, there should be opportunities for new challenges and variety in assignments as experience and study sharpen and refine competence. With these opportunities and challenges, which in themselves are incentives, there should be career long incentives in prerogatives, status, and material recompense.

To become a profession, teaching needs different structures and organization. School faculties must be organized so that students have more options for learning, teachers have a number of alternatives in teaching, and greater attention is given to the individual learner. To achieve redesign in teaching, the school requires redesign as well.

As a part of such redesign, structures are needed to help teachers grow along paths that foster continuous refinement and enhancement in the teacher's knowledge and skill. One structure for achieving that refinement and enhancement is the teacher or professional development center. This comparatively new structure for helping teachers stay

current and vital, and for fostering continuous growth, varies in organization and in the services it provides. Variety is essential if local context and community uniqueness, among other things, are to be recognized and honored. Whatever the nature of the structure, it should provide professional stimulation, intellectual challenge, emotional lift, and variety in tasks. It should be accompanied by personal, professional, and material rewards. It should open opportunities for mobility and be available throughout a career. Vertical and lateral ladders among school staffing patterns provide a variety of models for such structures.

Some of the topics to keep in mind in planning for redesign are: (1) the mission of school; (2) the role of teacher or professional development centers; (3) the nature of career ladders; (4) the requirements of innovative and effective inservice education programs; (5) practical and effective models of school improvement; (6) the evaluation of professional performance; and (7) advisory supervision that helps teachers improve instruction (ATE, 1985).

The redesign should include opportunities for teachers and other school personnel:

* To discuss the problems involved in redesign of the profession.
* To examine real illustrations of school teams at work, recognizing the trials and the possible accomplishments of instigating redesign. (Illustrations can be found in reform under way in California, Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, and Tennessee.)
* To hammer out policies that provide the license, the time, the knowledge, the process, and the support required to develop and maintain a profession, and to report the achievements that will earn it regard as a profession.

To get at the matter of redesign, let us explore further the contribution of teacher and professional development centers to helping teachers be, and be acknowledged as, professionals.

Teacher centers have been structures for the professionalization of teaching in the United States for a number of years. Local, often independent, centers began to develop after the British model as long as 20 years ago. Nine years ago, the federal government gave the teacher center movement major impetus by funding programs in over 100 locations. Federal funding was short-lived, however, because the Teacher Centers Program was among about a hundred programs the Reagan administration consolidated into block grants to the states in the early 1980s.

Many teacher centers survived the elimination of direct federal support and continued in direct and indirect ways to professionalize teaching. Little information has been gathered on which teacher centers survived, how and why they were continued, how effective they have been, and where they secured support.

In order to discover whether and how the surviving centers continue to influence the teaching profession, I have maintained a personal network with center directors and leaders, worked with center personnel in workshops, visited and interviewed many of their directors, and written about them (Edelfelt & Johnson, 1981-82). Most recently, I conducted a survey of known surviving centers that originated with the federal Teacher Centers Program (Edelfelt & Bohstedt, in process). Data on the latter are not all in yet nor analyzed, but I do have impressions on the current status of these centers from reviewing the returned questionnaires. All of these experiences and exposures are reflected in the following.

The Mission of School and the Role of the Center

The mission of school has had unusual attention in the last three or four years. Most teacher centers have felt the pressure of that attention. Some have responded by changing name to become professional development centers.

In most cases, the influence has also tended to change the program of centers. Most evident is the inclusion of computer education in center offerings. California and New York centers have enlarged their center names to include "computer" or "technology." Other centers are making the new emphasis clear in program offerings and available equipment. Obviously, the center was the place to turn for technological assistance to teachers, and this indicates the status the center has earned in inservice education and staff development. Math and science also appear to be finding greater emphasis at centers.

A significant change is that most centers have expanded their programs. A few have experienced a shortage in funds and rough going, to the point of curtailing program. Some have ceased to operate. Expanded programs include more than technology, computers, math, and science. The overall trend is clearly an expansion from inservice education of teachers to staff development that includes all professional, and sometimes noncertified, staff. To characterize this expansion, center personnel describe their current emphasis in words such as "program oriented," "curriculum development," and"school improvement." Most centers also seem to be resource centers. Where centers have retrenched and curtailed effort, for example, the label "curriculum and resource center" has been attached.

Center leaders and school administrators seem to agree on the impact centers can make. The degree to which there is action to redesign the profession is not clearly explicit, except in a few places like California, Florida, and Tennessee, where centers are at work training teachers for next steps on some form of a career ladder. However, the move to redesign is implicit in many, many center programs. Much of this effort is subtle and fashioned to fit unique situations. For example, in Washington state, educational service districts (which perform among other services the role of professional development centers) are training mentors for the state's Beginning Teacher Assistance Program.

Programs have also expanded in scope. There are more long-term courses and workshops. School-district-mandated staff development has been added to the menu of offerings that respond to teachers' needs. Some districts find these parallel efforts in conflict; others find that district goals are broad and easy to mesh with efforts responsive to teacher needs.

School-district inservice credit and college graduate credit for work at centers have been approved in many situations, demonstrating the legitimacy centers have earned. Centers' acceptance has been fueled, in part, by their expansion to serve more than teacher needs. Considerable suspicion existed, and persisted, in the federal Teacher Centers Program because the required governance gave teachers preeminence on center policy boards. Reservations were reduced when school administrators found such delegation of power effective, and attitudes further improved when centers began viewing professional development more broadly. The gradual inclusion of longer, more substantive workshops and courses obviously has also contributed to credibility and acceptance.

The number and the types of people served by centers have changed in several ways. In addition to school administrators, centers report serving prospective, private, parochial, preschool, and student teachers; teacher aides; noncertified school personnel; parents; noneducation adults; and, in a few cases, college professors. Several indicate that they now work with more secondary school teachers. Initially, centers mainly appealed to, and attracted, elementary school teachers.

Despite the shifts in title, role and emphasis, the basic philosophy and structure of the center concept seem to have remained. Most centers still have policy boards, representing teachers, administrators, college personnel, and school board members, but predominantly teachers. Most continue to assess the needs of teachers, and others they now serve, in determining program.

One can only guess that in many school districts an accommodation has been reached between teachers and administrators on the matter of center decision-making, one clear indication of the professional stature teachers have gained. Teacher unions, initially strong and active supporters of teacher centers, now seem a step removed from them. Many teachers participate in centers, as users and as members of governance, wearing their professional hats rather than their union hats. Teachers seem able to deal with the ambiguity of being a professional on the one hand and a union member on the other. Unions, perhaps, have more difficulty in reconciling the conflict between wanting teachers' responsibilities specified in contracts and recognizing that professional behavior requires enough freedom and latitude to allow the teacher to respond to the uniqueness of each situation and each student. An irony is that unions have been strong advocates of teacher involvement in decision-making, while many so-called thick contracts have constrained what teachers can do to the point of restricting their decision-making prerogatives.

Career Ladders and Professional Development

The conflict of union and professional purposes has come to the fore in a number of states and local school districts where attempts have been made to differentiate teacher roles. In Tennessee, for example, the teachers' union at first opposed the career ladder program proposed by the governor. The issue, it seems, was more a matter of not being consulted than being unequivocally opposed to career ladders because, after consultation and some modification in the plan, the union supported the program. Neither the flaws in the program or the limited nature of its differentiating roles, both basic professional questions, has been criticized by the Tennessee union since the program was instituted.

The program in Tennessee has equated completion of training or demonstration of knowledge by standardized test as criteria for promotion on the career ladder. It is more a merit pay plan than a career ladder. The Tennessee program gives almost no attention to performance in teaching. The different tasks teachers are permitted to undertake at various steps in the program, although important to professionalism, are largely external to teaching students in regular classes. The tasks include mentoring beginning teachers, advising and coaching experienced teachers, conducting workshops, and serving on committees to create and select materials and to develop curriculum. One truly creative wrinkle in the program is a direct contact program with students, before and after school and in summers, that puts teachers on the second and third steps of the career ladder in a position to be innovative about ways to challenge students in special programs of all types.

Evaluation for promotion on the career ladder is based largely on paper credentials, reporting what teachers have studied and demonstrated they know rather than on how well they function professionally. The program fosters few innovative approaches to continuing education, and the relationship of staff development to more proficient performance as a teacher is lacking. Where there is innovation, it is largely in the programs of support offered at teacher centers.

Evaluation of teaching, where it exists, is often mechanistic. Evaluating authorities are typically supercautious, depending heavily on data that are verifiable, that can be presented convincingly in a court of law should a challenge to an evaluation be made. Evaluation is usually restricted to classroom performance and focused on specific teaching acts that evaluation specialists argue have been proven effective in the research on teaching. Teaching effectiveness is determined on the basis of scores a teacher's students get on standardized tests. The context in which a teacher performs is often ignored, the same standards being applied regardless of the type of student, the quality of school climate and faculty morale, and other factors. Evaluation in Florida's system considers context in what educators there call "frame." In their formula for scoring evaluations, the frame factor compensates for context.

Centers for professional development have shied away from these narrow approaches to evaluation. I surmise this is so because teacher and professional development centers realize that the ability of a teacher to be effective depends on a variety of factors, including the context in which teaching takes place.

Perhaps another reason centers have avoided an emphasis on teacher evaluation is the purpose to which evaluation is presently committed, that is, identifying adequacy in teaching. Center personnel and programs most certainly evaluate, but the process takes place with the teacher. It is diagnostic, designed for self-analysis, rather than for making judgments, for deciding competence or incompetence. Centers work primarily with teachers who are tenured, who have been through the check points in college, in certification, and in tenure. Experts and peers have passed judgment on such teachers, and center personnel see their job as contributing to the further improvement of the practitioner.

The argument for striving to foster growth by helping the individual recognize his or her own strengths and weaknesses has strong philosophical and psychological underpinnings. It respects the dignity of the individual. It esteems personal and professional perceptions. It creates a positive atmosphere for learning. It is consistent with recognized principles of learning. It fosters a constructive working relationship between the teacher and the learner. It honors past judgments and credentials. It treats the practitioner as a professional.

The collective impact of teacher and professional development centers seems impressive to this point. Granted there are only a few hundred such centers. They serve only a small portion of the over two and a half million teachers in the United States and exist in only a fraction of the over fifteen thousand school districts. Where centers are operating, they seem to have helped to democratize teaching, to reassure administrators that sharing power is productive, to vitalize teaching, to provide counsel and comfort to beleaguered teachers, to make available innumerable materials for teaching, and to convince teachers that they are professionals.

The expansion of teacher centers to professional development centers is under way. It is a positive move for professionalism. It will foster school improvement if teachers, administrators, and other school personnel work together on the myriad issues critical to creating and maintaining quality schools. It may be more important, at this point in history, to focus on a school faculty and its effectiveness, and on the means of determining the different tasks an effective school requires of teachers, than to focus on the routine competence of the individual practitioner. The long history of emphasis on the individual teacher has led to great improvements in the preparation and the competence of teachers. That is and continues to be important. The next big step in the improvement of education, I believe, must be emphasis on the school as a learning community. Students, after all, experience school holistically. Education is, or should be, an integration of all that school days, weeks, and years entail.

My conclusion is that professional development centers can be the structure in each school district to foster school improvement. At the same time, centers can help teachers, and other school personnel, achieve professional status in image and in fact. The teacher center philosophy apparently is both solid and durable. Even though names have changed, the experience of teacher centers can continue in professional development centers, and its central goals could be the further professionalization of teaching and the improvement of schools.

References

Association of Teacher Educators. Developing Career Ladders. Reston, VA: ATE, 1985.

Edelfelt, R. A., & M. Johnson. Teacher Center Impact (A series of 15 papers on innovative practices in selected teacher centers). Washington, D.C.: Edelfelt-Johnson, Inc., 1981-82.

Edelfelt, R. A., & J. Bohstedt. The Impact of Federally Funded Teacher Centers, in process.

CHAPTER 8

TEACHER SELF-EVALUATION: A MODEL FOR A PROFESSIONAL APPROACH TO INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

Robert L. Scholl
Miami University

The bad news in teacher self-evaluation is that not much is happening. And what is happening seems to have negative overtones. There are reasons for this condition. Teachers don't seem to have much enthusiasm for self-evaluation (Neely, 1973). Few teachers have the ability to assess their own performance objectively (Brighton 1985; Walberg and Carroll, 1981; Peck and Tucker, 1973; Walberg and Thomas, 1972), and teachers have rarely been supported and encouraged to reflect on their teaching performance (Dillon-Peterson, 1986; Wolf, 1973). Teachers have been infected with the idea that improvement is something done to them and that the responsibility for upgrading their skills, attitudes and knowledge is not theirs. This state is largely brought about by what Wise and Darling-Hammond (1984) refer to as the "bureaucratic requirement" of teacher evaluation that is perfunctory, routine and of no help to teachers.

But not to worry! There is good news regarding teacher self-evaluation. Hunter (1984, p. 181) writes, "One of the most powerful techniques for producing professional growth is introspection into one's own teaching." In a nationwide study on teaching behavior of effective secondary teachers, Pribble and Scholl (1986) found that while teachers are not using self--evaluation to a great extent, they believe they should be engaged in extensive efforts to self-assess. Betty Dillon-Peterson (1986, p. 32), a school-based supervisor in the Lincoln, Nebraska public schools, writes, "I know from experience that, given the encouragement, teachers are entirely capable of identifying directions for self-improvement and carrying out plans to improve their effectiveness." Success can be obtained when teachers are trained and encouraged in the use of self-evaluation. In a five-year follow-up study of 200 teachers who were trained in Bailey's seven-step model of teacher self-assessment, Bailey (1981) found that those teachers remained competent in the use of self-assessment skills and that they continued to value self-evaluation strategies.

If we believe in the professionalization of teaching, we must focus on classroom teachers and their role in this process of improvement. After all, in the last analysis, what makes the difference in schools is how the teacher does his/her job. Teachers must have the right to reasonable participation in the decisions that affect their professional lives. Teachers must also assume reasonable responsibility for their own growth. This cannot be brought about by a program of evaluation where stan-

dards are imposed, where teachers are appraised by matching their performances against some long-listed rating scale and where summative evaluation rules. One of the primary goals for an appraisal program should be the establishment of a foundation for professional development for individual staff members. The ultimate in a staff development program would be achieved when professionals accept the responsibility for assessing their own needs and carry out plans for meeting those needs in a sort of professional self-actualization process.

Most teachers want to improve. Given the time, encouragement and the knowledge to assess effectively, they can improve. A commitment must be made by the entire school community to provide a climate that supports the professional responsibilities of self-analysis for improvement.

So there is another form of news. The news of promise.

McGreal (1983, p. 131) states, "Most of the inadequacies attached to self-evaluation are not weaknesses in the concept. Rather, they result from the misunderstanding or misuse in school settings." The news of promise is that a well-developed program of self-evaluation can be a viable approach to instructional improvement. What follows is a model to provide a framework for self-directed professional improvement.

The Model

This self-evaluation model is an attempt to insure that staff development is directed toward the individual professional. It involves the teacher directly in the process of improvement. This personalized approach treats teachers differently according to their personal/professional developmental differences, their special teaching assignments and the goals they have for themselves and their clients. The model is an attempt to provide a means for putting teachers in a central position of responsibility for their own development--a position of professional accountability. This structure is an attempt to negate the negative views that teachers often have regarding improvement practices. Teachers tend to view current practices as interfering with rather than nurturing the professional approach and spirit of improvement.

This model is not an attempt to supplant the roles to be played by administrators/supervisors. Nor is there any intent to say this approach should be employed by the exclusion of any program of collegial aid in the improvement procedure. Both colleagues and administrators/supervisors are important in the promotion of a self-help process.

Self-assessment for this model is defined as an objective and systematic process of self-appraisal, the purpose of which is instructional improvement. The focus is on formative evaluation

as opposed to a summative approach. Formative evaluation keynotes development and involves diagnosis, improvement strategies, data-gathering, analysis and change or maintenance strategies.

Premises and Objectives

There are certain premises that undergird this model and create a foundation from which the model is structured. Among those that are critical are the premises that:

1. Skill development and attitude formation regarding self-evaluation needs to begin at the pre-service stage of the teacher's career.

2. Accountability for effective teaching and personal growth should become part of the teacher's professional responsibility.

3. A positive climate and support system favorable to self-directed improvement should be developed and maintained by the administrative structure.

4. Evaluation and improvement should be based on mutual commitment to growth and change, and evaluation should be participatory.

5. Current effectiveness research, common sense and the best of current accepted practice in teaching should be a strong focus for improvement practices.

6. Teachers, as adults, learn better when they are self-directing and have some degree of autonomy regarding plans for their improvement.

7. The conditions of personal/professional development must be considered and the unique needs of various stages addressed in self-help process.

8. A goal-setting, clinically-oriented approach to improvement should be used.

The purposes of this self-assessment model are to:

1. Aid each teacher and teacher candidate in the realization of the need for personal and professional growth.

2. Educate each teacher and teacher candidate in a systematic approach for actualizing self-assessment.

3. Monitor the implementation of teacher and teacher candidate self-assessment.

4. Promote a positive professional attitude toward the evaluation process.

5. Help teachers become aware of their teaching effectiveness and how to develop strategies for change and/or maintenance of teaching behaviors.

6. Focus staff development on the individual needs of the teacher.

Phases

The model is divided into two phases. Phase one begins at the pre-service level, and phase two is carried out during the time the teacher is under contract in a school setting.

In phase one (see Figure 1), the pre-service student would be engaged in formal course experiences that would lead to a positive attitude set toward self-assessment and competency in the analysis of his/her own teaching performance. Essential to the development of these competencies is the in-depth exploration of the answers to four basic questions:

1. What are my needs and what goals must be addressed to meet those needs?

2. What is effective teaching?

3. What constitutes clear, meaningful standards of effective teaching?

4. What would be an appropriate and effective approach for me to take for self-assessment?

BE AN INCENTIVE TEACHER
PROJECT TO DESIGN TEACHER INCENTIVE STRUCTURES
THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

Figure 1. Model for Instructional Improvement Through Self-Assessment, Phase One: Pre-Service

FORMAL COURSEWORK

Coursework is designed to answer four questions:

-What are my needs and what goals must be addressed to meet these needs?

-What is effective teaching?

-What constitutes clear, meaningful standards of effective teaching?

-What would be an effective-appropriate approach for me to take for self-assessment?

Answers to these questions are found through instructional modules:

-Becoming familiar with the concept of self-assessment.

-Exploring effective teaching practices.

-Identifying standards for effective teaching.

-Analyzing teacher behavior.

-Designing a self-assessment system.

-Plans for implementing a self-assessment program.

STUDENT TEACHING

Student teacher fully implements his/her plan for self-assessment. Plan is monitored and evaluated by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

Each teacher candidate would discover the answers to the questions above through formal instructional experiences. These experiences would be developed as courses, as parts of courses, or as independent study. Input would be given to each student by university faculty, public school personnel, and other students. The purpose of this input is to help the candidate forge a practical and effective system for self-appraisal.

The instructional experiences are:

1. **Becoming familiar with the concept of self-assessment. The intent here is to provide background information on self-appraisal and to develop positive attitudes toward it.**

2. **Exploring effective teaching practices. The focus would be on the nature of the instructional process and identification of the kinds of evidence that are necessary to make reasonable judgments about what effective instruction is.**

3. **Identifying standards for effective teaching. Students would be asked to define areas of responsibility for classroom teachers, to form specific statements of job functions and to develop criteria to be used to determine accomplishment of these functions. Standards can be highly individualized and/or institutionalized.**

4. **Analyzing teacher behavior. Targeted here would be the concepts of systematic observation, observation instrument construction, interaction analysis, goal setting and implementation strategies.**

5. **Designing a self-assessment system. Each student would develop his/her own approach to self-assessment.**

6. **Implementation of a self-assessment system. Students would gain assistance in implementation of their systems during the student teaching phase of their program.**

Critical to this first phase is the last module described above. This provides the opportunity for the university students to try out their programs for self-evaluation in school settings. The university supervisors and cooperating teachers must be well-versed in the whole process so that they can give expert advice and help in the implementation and evaluation of the self-assessment system designed by the student teacher.

Phase two of this model deals with the in-service teachers (see Figure 2). Those who are employed by a school district.

Figure 2. Model for Instructional Improvement Through Self-Assessment, Phase Two: In-Service

SCHOOL DISTRICT

Have goals established through needs assessment procedures.

Staff development plan which includes provision for an individual approach to improvement.

Well-developed staff evaluation plan.

SELF-DIRECTED IMPROVEMENT PROCESS

New teachers are introduced to goals, staff development program and evaluation system.

Goal setting. Each teacher is to select several goals for professional improvement.

Plans are developed for reaching goals. This includes use of resources, data collection and means of measuring accomplishment of goals.

Implement plans. Teacher makes periodic checks on progress. Others, when needed, provide feedback assistance and support.

Final report is made at end of evaluation cycle. Report shared with supervisor. Improvement goals are determined for next evaluation cycle.

SUPPORT FUNCTION

Administrators are responsible for providing support structure and encouragement that creates a climate that is conducive to the self-directed process.

Administrators provide the means for feedback to evaluate and improve the entire self-evaluation process.

Each district should, through needs assessment procedures, establish goals for the entire district. Needs are then translated into goals for individual buildings. These goals are shared with the instructional staff. Each school district should have an overall plan and policy for staff development and evaluation of instruction. The policy should include philosophy, definitions, program elements, standards, procedures, time-tables and means for in-service for administrators as well as teachers.

Teachers new to the district would, through orientation and inservice programs, be fully informed of the district policies regarding staff development and the evaluation program. They would also be appraised of the current goals for the district and individual schools.

Key to the program is the goal-setting activity. New teachers will probably need the aid of supervisors or mentors to help them establish their improvement goals because of their stages of development. Tenured teachers would be expected to take the lead in establishing their improvement goals. Means for collecting data relative to the goals should be established and standards set for determining if goals have been met. Goals and means for collecting data and measurement should be in written form.

After goals are determined and means for collecting data set, the teacher implements his/her plans for self-assessment. The teacher determines what sources will be needed in terms of material or personnel. These may involve use of technology, peers, workshops, graduate courses, intra- or inter-school visitation, professional literature, etc. The teacher continually assesses his/her progress by reviewing the goals set for self-improvement.

At the end of the evaluation cycle, the teacher prepares a report describing to what extent goals were achieved and presents evidence to support the attainment of his/her goals. At the end of the report, the teacher suggests improvement goals for the next evaluation cycle and plans for their accomplishment.

Administrators are charged with the responsibility for providing the support and encouragement necessary for teachers to engage in self-appraisal. The climate established should be one of openness without the threat of recrimination for the disclosure of weaknesses on the part of teachers. Supervisors should be available to discuss progress, to share problems if needed and to be a resource for teachers in their quests for improvement.

The intent of this model is to provide a framework within which teachers can take a professional approach to improve their work with children. It is a model designed to create both a positive attitude set and a set of skills needed to practice self-assessment. The model focuses on the concept of formative evaluation with provisions for the developmental stages of teachers as adult learners. It is hoped that this approach will bring teachers and administrators closer together in a meaningful way so that a sense of fulfillment and high morale will prevail. Finally, it is intended that this model will provide the opportunity for professional growth that will create productive, self-reflective professionals who will engage in authentic appraisal of their teaching and thus bring about improvement of instruction and learning.

References

Bailey, Gerald D. Teacher Self-Assessment: A Means for Improving Classroom Instruction, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1981.

Brighton, S. Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Carroll, J. G. "Faculty Self-Evaluation." in Handbook of Teacher Evaluation, edited by J. Millman, Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage, 1981, pp. 180-200.

Dillon-Peterson, Betty. "Trusting Teachers to Know What's Good for Them." In Improving Teaching, edited by Karen K. Zumwalt, Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986.

Hunter, Madeline. "Knowing, Teaching and Supervising." In Using What We Know About Teaching, edited by Philip L. Hosford, Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

McGreal, Thomas L. Successful Teacher Evaluation, Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Neely, John. A Review of Research on Teacher Education, edited by Levon Balzer. Columbus, OH: ERIC/SMEAC, 1973.

Peck, Robert F. and Tucker, James A. "Research on Teacher Education." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, edited by Robert M. W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, pp. 940-78.

Pribble, Donald and Scholl, Robert. "Effective Teachers Speak Out: The Reality of Research on Teaching." Paper presented at the annual meeting of AACTE, Chicago, IL.: February, 1986.

Walberg, H. J. and Thomas, S. C. "Open Education: An Operational Definition and Validation in Great Britain and the United States." American Educational Research Journal 9 (1972): pp. 197-207.

Wise, Arthur E. and Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Teacher Evaluation and Teacher Professionalism." Educational Leadership 42 (4): 1984, pp. 28-33.

Wolf, Robert. "How Teachers Feel Toward Evaluation." In School Evaluation, edited by Ernest Hans, Berkey, CA.: McCutchan, 1973.

CHAPTER 9

NON-SALARY INCENTIVES

James J. Cellio and Claire L. Jacobi
Maumee City Schools

Non-salary incentives reflect only a single portion of the entire framework for enhancing the teaching profession and our schools. This chapter will present a rationale for the use of non-salary rewards as opposed to salary rewards and identify potential sources of funding available for such rewards. By non-salary incentives the authors are referring here to those methods and means of rewarding and encouraging effective teacher performance which, while perhaps having a dollar cost, do not involve salary increases or other direct payments to individuals.

Salary Incentives

1983 was a benchmark year for education in the United States. In that year, A Nation at Risk was published and immediately created a controversy concerning the effectiveness of our American system of education. One statement in the report dealt with the role of the teacher and indicated that: "Salary, promotion, tenure, and retention discussions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that includes peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and poor ones either improved or terminated" (p. 5). With this statement, merit pay was reborn. President Reagan echoed the report's sentiment in speaking at Seton Hall University when he stated that teachers should be paid and promoted on the basis of their merit and competence and that schools have no business rewarding incompetence and mediocrity.

Three years have passed since the National Commission's report, and much research has been examined and evaluated as it concerns teachers and merit pay. Although much of the early information on this issue was dramatically presented in the media, the reports that followed were more educational and less political in approach, more positive and less negative in outlook, and more data-based and less emotional.

It is the opinion of many researchers that salary incentives related to teaching effectiveness are generally not useful methods of reward. They may be used and even work in isolated school districts where they have long been in place, but overall, they have no future for the majority of public school districts in the United States.

This opinion was confirmed by the year-long study of teacher incentives conducted in 1984-85 in the Maumee City School District and supported by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. Five task forces were established to carry out the objectives of the teacher incentives study, with one group specifically assigned to consider salary incentives. The Salary Incentives Task Force was made up of four staff members from the Maumee City Schools (including the two authors

of this article), one staff member from the Toledo Catholic Schools' Office, and two Maumee community members. Our task force reviewed the literature on salary incentives, merit pay, and related topics solicited. We comments, suggestions, and reactions from colleagues both within and outside of the teaching profession and considered at length the costs, advantages, disadvantages, implications, and possible effects of teacher incentives, both monetary and non-monetary.

There was complete agreement among the salary Incentives Task Force members on the need to recognize and reinforce the conscientious efforts and excellent teaching demonstrated by many staff members in both the Maumee City Schools and the schools of the Catholic Diocese of Toledo. However, determining ways to recognize and reward these teachers and locating the resources to do so presented complex problems. It must be stated here that our task force was not opposed to salary incentives for teachers. We felt that teachers can and should be rewarded monetarily. However, we did not believe that this reward should be part of the basic salary schedule for teachers. Rather, it shcould be separate and distinct and directed to the teacher in a variety of forms, such as equipment purchases, reimbursement for costs associated with professional endeavors, awards, university course work and the like.

Why not use salary incentives? Most education experts view merit pay plans, career ladders, and other individual salary incentive programs as lacking in overall efficacy, especially in improving instruction in all classes for all students, which should certainly be the primary goal of any school system. Some of the problems associated with salary incentive programs are: criteria on which salary incentives are awarded, types of evaluation instruments used, teacher morale, increased competition with reduced collegiality and professionalism, substitution of individual gain for increased group success, establishment of quotas, teacher isolation, costs of development and implementation, and the substitution of material goals for intrinsic goals related to the worker and the workplace. Moreover, merit pay, career ladders and other such salary incentive programs have a long and consistent history of failure since their introduction in this country in the early 1900's. Nor do such programs effectively address the recruitment problem in the teaching profession.

In summary, salary incentives reward a few, often arbitrarily, and do little to spur others to greater efforts. They can foster jealously and pettiness, reduce self-esteem, affect professional relationships in negative ways. They are often neither reliable nor valid in measuring the accomplishment of school goals and objectives.

Non-Salary Alternatives

We believe the following major efforts should be made toward improving teaching effectiveness in a school district like Maumee. First, a standing committee should be formed that rewards teachers through district-wide recognition. Second, non-salary rewards should be researched and utilized. Third, the school district should work

closely with the university in the area of teacher education. Fourth, a mentor program should be initiated for all newly employed teachers. Fifth, classroom evaluation should focus on the development of teacher capabilities rather than ranking or categorizing teachers. Sixth, the district should attempt to reduce teacher isolation by providing an environment that fosters collegiality, collaboration and professionalism. Seventh, the school district should develop a model of group or team rewards, both monetary and non-monetary, that is based on specific and well defined criteria.

There is a wide variety of non-salary rewards that could be provided for teachers. Their exact nature and number are limited only by the creativity and flexibility of the school district and its resources, both from within its own funding structure and from support groups in the community such as parent organizations, businesses, and service clubs. Some examples of non-salary rewards are: (1) reimbursement for university course work, (2) released time for professional conferences, (3) payment of travel expenses, lodging and registration fees, (4) purchase of additional instructional materials for classrooms, (5) released time for grade level or department meetings, (6) increased time for classroom planning and preparation, (7) reduction in non-teaching duties, (8) assistance from a clerical aide, (9) establishment of a Teacher Recognition Awards Program and (10) development of a mentor program.

Reimbursement for appropriate graduate coursework at the university would be an excellent way to reward teachers. When teachers apply for and enroll in courses related to their specific fields of study or to the profession in general, they are demonstrating a willingness to learn more about their disciplines and profession. Teachers should be reinforced in this endeavor. Likewise, attendance at professional conferences, inservice programs and university-sponsored workshops should be granted with greater regularity. Providing even some portion of the registration, travel, and/or lodging costs of a conference along with the opportunity to attend adds to the value of the professional activity. When teachers are treated with dignity, they will respond with a professional approach that can facilitate greater sharing of learning experiences as well.

Another excellent method used to support teachers through monetary but non-salary means is the purchase of classroom equipment and instructional materials. According to Frase, Hertzel and Grant (1982), the more popular choices among recipients of a reward in a school district in Tucson, Arizona, were attendance at conferences or purchase of instructional equipment such as a microcomputer, a telescope, an aquarium, and a camera.

As we study non-monetary incentives, one of the most useful means we discover is to reward teachers with released time. This time can be used in at least two different ways. First, released time can be used by a teacher for individual planning and preparation of course content and curricular development as these correspond to the teaching assignment. When a teacher is properly prepared, when goals and

objectives are organized, when teaching style and delivery are sharpened, the act and art of teaching is improved. Second, released time can be applied to group settings that involve grade levels or departments. As stated earlier, collaborative activities are conducive to development of professionalism among teachers. Such activities can strengthen both the common bond of a group and the group's performance. Reward systems that are offered to grade levels or instructional departments can be very important in fostering a team concept and in boosting morale. In support of this observation, Rosenholtz (1984) reports research indicating that the most effective schools (i.e., those where student gains are unusually great) are those which encourage professional dialogue and collaboration.

The Salary Incentives Task Force also recommended reduction of non-teaching duties as a form of non-salary reward. Providing assistance to teachers through clerical aides and other support personnel was encouraged. Boyer (1983) identified the following list of menial tasks among teacher duties: lunchroom supervision, hall patrol, chaperoning student activities, clerical work in preparation of instructional materials, and keeping student attendance records. It is understood that teachers cannot simply divorce themselves from all pupil personnel functions. The point is, however, that many tasks performed by teachers during a typical school day are of a paraprofessional nature, and attention to these tasks reduces the amount of time for instruction. By giving groups of teachers (either at a department or grade level) opportunity to apply for additional paraprofessional assistance, we can both reward initiative and organization demonstrated in their proposals and increase the amount of time teachers spend directly involved in teaching youngsters.

Another task force recommendation involved the establishment of a formal, structured program in the school system for appointing a mentor for each newly-employed teacher. The mentor would have specific, non-evaluative responsibilities designed to orient the new staff member to the procedures, regulations, and culture of the school system and to assist him/her toward greater instructional effectiveness. A first-year teacher needs support. He/she has very few opportunities to identify and emulate teaching excellence. The reward to the mentor teacher would come from the recognition associated with being named a mentor, or "master teacher," worthy of being emulated. The recognition could be supplemented by a lapel pin, certificate, letter of appreciation, recognition dinner or the like.

A final recommendation was the development of an Educator Recognition Awards Program. Our task force encouraged the school district to establish a Educator Recognition Committee. The purpose of this committee is to find ways for recognizing teachers and demonstrate that their work and efforts in the classroom are valued and appreciated. Recognition thus far has been in the form of an award and lapel pin monthly for three teachers nominated by their peers; inclusion of several staff members in a special dinner hosted by the Maumee Chamber of Commerce; "salutes" in the local press and school publications; notes of appreciation from parents which were encouraged through a

special "Applegram" form included with student grade cards; and the distribution of flowers and gift certificates from local restaurants during "Thank-A-School-Employee" week. The Educator Recognition Committee has also been working with several community service groups, such as Kiwanis and the Business and Professional Women's Club, to develop a program for recognizing teachers in the district. A number of teachers would be invited periodically to the group's luncheon or dinner meeting and would be presented with a small token of appreciation/recognition.

Other school districts should give serious consideration to a similar committee and to similar kinds of recognition. While the tangible rewards provided by such a program are small in material value, they have nonetheless a real impact on teacher morale and performance. A teacher's primary responsibility is to the children he/she instructs. Yet many times a teacher goes through a school year, or a number of school years, without any recognition from students or parents or peers. The fact is the majority of teachers receive no thanks, no praise, no support from the students with whom they work. In addition, while instruction is central to the role of teaching, there are many other responsibilities carried out by a teacher that go unnoticed by supervisors or colleagues. As stated earlier, teachers must feel good about the workplace. They must receive praise and support and be made to feel part of the educational process. Everyone in a school district plays a vital role in its overall success. The school staff is interdependent, and they must rely on one another. All staff members have input that makes them special; they should be recognized for their valuable contribution. But teacher recognition should not be competitive. An awards committee should strive to find at least one positive activity or service that each teacher provides and see that he/she is rewarded for it. Research has indicated that, while a teacher's salary is an important factor in motivating his/hercareer choice, a more compelling force is the desire to serve, the desire to educate and interact with children. We must make teaching worthwhile by recognizing and rewarding members of this worthy profession.

Sources of Support

In looking at the development and implementation of a non-salary incentive plan, several sources of revenue for support might be utilized, although the likelihood of receiving funds is dependent on a number of factors. One source of funding might be the federal government in the form of a grant. This would require a proposal in which the goals and objectives would be stated and a means of evaluation identified. The probability of receiving a federal grant for non-salary incentives seems small at present, however, due to the current administration's reduction in the budget of the Department of Education.

Another source might be the school district itself. If possible, money in its general fund could be earmarked for recognition purposes. A line item in the budget could then be specifically allocated to a non-salary rewards system. A problem with this approach might be that funds would have to be taken from some other area and placed in this special category. In some districts, this may be "robbing Peter to pay

Paul." However, a separate school foundation might be established so that monies could be set aside to generate interest. The interest could then be used to fund a reward system developed by the school district.

A third source of funding and probably the most likely is private industry. In order for this method to succeed, businesses and industries in the school community must be brought into partnership with the schools. In many companies, advertising is a very important activity. Companies large and small may be very receptive to the idea of rewarding teachers monetarily or non-monetarily if the firms receive some advertisement in the form of recognition for sponsorship. For example, a recognition dinner sponsored by a local insurance firm with awards financed by the agent would not only be beneficial for the teachers but would also demonstrate the educational commitment of the firm.

In summary, the Salary Incentives Task Force believes in a reward or recognition system as an incentive to good teaching. We believe non-salary rewards in the form of monetary or non-monetary incentives are a professional way of recognizing individuals and groups of teachers. We believe teachers would be supportive of this concept and work toward being a part of it. We believe it would strengthen morale and lead to more collaboration in teaching, thus also leading to greater excellence in education. We believe that, in order to support such efforts, adequate funding must be provided. Perhaps the most realistic means available would be the development of partnerships between a school district and community businesses and industries.

References

Boyer, Ernest L. High School. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1983.

Frase, Larry E., Hertzel, Robert W., and Grant, Robert T. "Merit Pay: A Research-Based Alternative in Tucson." Phi Delta Kappan 64: 266-269; December 1982.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. "A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform," U.S. Office of Education, April, 1983.

Rosenholtz, Susan J. and Kyle, Susan J. "Teacher Isolation: Barrier to Professionalism." American Educator 8: 10-15, Winter 1984.

CHAPTER 10

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR TEACHER INCENTIVE STRUCTURES

James R. Gress
The University of Toledo

Current efforts to enhance the teaching profession through a variety of incentives is, in large part, a political response to public perceptions of teaching and the teaching profession. To say that incentives are largely a political response to public perceptions is not to demean the profession or the public's current response. Rather, it is to say that public perceptions and responses, both of the current problems facing the teaching profession and of proposed incentive solutions, are significant.

Public Attitudes Toward Teaching

The latest annual poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools (Gallup, 1985) is instructive in assessing current public perceptions and responses to teachers and teaching. Three things stand out among the pole's findings with respect to teachers. First, teachers tend to receive generally high grades from the public, especially teachers working in respondents' respective communities. Almost half of teachers received grades of A and B from the public in general; more than two-thirds did as well in particular communities. Three percent or less received a failing grade.

Secondly, almost forty percent of the public believes teachers' salaries are just about right, a perception that has been unchanged during the past five years. However, nearly one-third of respondents believe salaries are too low.

Thirdly, the current difficulty schools face in getting, and keeping, good teachers followed lack of discipline, use of drugs, and poor curriculum standards as the fourth biggest problem facing the schools in 1985. The public is greatly concerned about keeping its schools staffed by excellent teachers.

Gallup's 17th annual poll is also instructive in assessing some of the incentives being widely considered for enhancing the teaching profession and improving our schools. "Six Americans in ten favor merit pay for teachers" (Gallup, 1985, p. 39). Almost ninety percent of respondents favored competency testing to test teachers' general knowledge.

An important question to be raised in this context is what are public perceptions and responses with respect to the variety of incentives which have been devised to enhance teaching further, a necessary condition for improving American schools.

Public Perceptions and Community Survey

To address this question, our 1984-85 USDoE Teacher Incentive Grant surveyed community participants in the grant project. The University of Toledo's "Project to Design Teacher Incentive Structures" joined university personnel with professional educators and community representatives in a number of task forces to design incentive structures in five areas: (1) teacher recruitment, preparation and certification, (2) teacher career ladders, (3) school staff development, (4) merit pay and (5) teacher image. The Maumee, Ohio, community and its public and parochial schools are a stable, upper-middle-class suburban population.

The community survey was conducted to assess perceptions, responses and potential support for a variety of professional incentives. In addition to the Gallup findings, the principal data for anticipating community responses included public perceptions identified by an ASCD task force (1985, pp 2-7):

1. Teaching is an unsophisticated and relatively simple job.

2. Since teaching is simple, evaluation of teaching must be simple.

3. The public schools are staffed by lazy (and/or incompetent) teachers.

4. Money will motivate highly qualified people to select teaching and persuade them to stay in teaching once there.

5. The teaching profession cannot attract and hold first-rate personnel because it lacks performance-based financial incentives.

6. Merit pay is linked to raising standards in education.

Survey Design

An instrument to survey community opinion was drafted by Project staff based on review of teacher incentive literature. Discussion of the draft instrument by members of the Project's Steering Committee resulted in a six part questionnaire, five parts each with a minimum number of items with a Likert response scale for the respective areas of Project study and a final part for respondent demographics.

Sample and Response. A directory listing names and addresses of 6,916 residences and businesses in the Maumee community was used to select a random sample for the survey. However, the sample did exclude residential listings which identified a household member as a professional educator employed by any school system. In those cases, the next non-educator residential listing was selected instead.

The sample of 1009 (14.8% of the population) residences and businesses included the following:

	N	%
Residences with School-age Children	605	60
Residences without School-age Children	252	25
Businesses	152	15
Total	1,009	100

A total of 142 usable returns (14.7% of the sample) included the following:

	N	%
Residences with School-age Children	49	34
Residences without School-age Children	69	49
Businesses	24	17
Total	149	100

Thus, respondents included both a proportionate number of sample businesses but, among residences, a disproportionately greater number of those without school-age children.

Other Respondent Demographics. Respondents included nearly equal numbers of males and females distributed over identified age groups. 68.9% were 26-45 years old. Half the respondents, both resident and business, had been in the community more than fifteen years. Respondents included residents with school-age children at all Maumee City and both Catholic schools, both current and past students.

Survey Findings*

The following summarizes community perceptions and support for a variety of teacher incentive proposals in the five areas of project study and design.

Recruitment, Preparation and Certification. Except for proposals to bypass traditional teacher preparation and certification routes, about 75% of respondents agreed with proposals for change. Seventy-three percent felt (30% strongly) that teacher education colleges should be more selective; 22% did not. Nine percent expressed no opinion about certification exceptions, 4% about college selectivity.

Almost 80% believed more financial support is needed for teacher preparation. Only 48% agreed to let passing national exams substitute for college preparation.

---

*Complete data tabulations and statistics summaries can be found in James R. Gress, "Incentives for Teaching: A Survey of Community Perceptions and Support" (The University of Toledo, February, 1986). Abstracted in Resources in Education ED 258 965, August, 1986.

Fifty-eight percent of respondents agreed to a need for making exceptions to present certification requirements to bring need skills into schools. Eighty percent agreed to eliminating permanent certificates in favor of periodic renewals throughout a teacher's career.

Respondents agreed with requiring a state exam for certification. Agreement varied from 77% to 90% with respect to examining interpersonal skills, organization and planning, professional competencies, basic skills and subject proficiency.

Career Ladder. Respondents were in strong agreement that recognition for teachers should vary with respect to identified criteria. Agreement was 90%, 80%, 77%, 70% and 60%, respectively, for recognition for demonstrated excellence in teaching skills, significant student achievement, superior subject-matter knowledge, peer respect and length of service. Strong agreement varied similarly for these criteria. In addition, 15 and 10% of respondents expressed no opinion o gave no response with respect to length of service and peer respect; only 3% gave those responses with respect to the other identified criteria.

Agreement about the responsibilities of a master teacher varied among respondents. Eighty two percent of respondents agreed that master teachers should develop curriculum; 78% agreed they should design teacher education. Sixty three percent agreed master teachers should work with gifted and talented students. However, only 57% agreed they should evaluate peer performance, and only 54% agreed they should conduct research. Fifteen percent expressed no opinion or gave no response with respect to conducting research.

Staff Development. Over 95% of respondents agreed that school policies should support professional growth and development of staff. Eighty one percent recognized a need for support programs for beginning teachers. Seventy-eight percent agreed that curriculum development is every teacher's responsibility.

More than three-fourths of respondents believed teachers should participate in the training of those coming into the profession. However, almost 15% disagreed, and 9% either expressed no opinion or gave no response, both high frequencies of these latter responses.

Least positive responses were given to the proposition that school staff development should relate to personal development. Slightly more than two-thirds agreed, but 15% disagreed and almost 17% expressed no opinion or gave no response.

With respect to the design of staff development, the teacher participants' involvement in planning and active learning were recognized by almost 95% of respondents. A need for staff development focused on improving teaching skills and student learning objectives was seen by almost 90%. Eighty percent recognized need for focus on individual teacher objectives as well. Eighty-five percent of respondents agreed with a need for teachers to visit other schools. Over 80% acknowledged the importance of time in development.

Largest disagreements were 20%, respectively, who did not recognize the importance of individual teacher objectives or the importance of time in staff development.

Merit Pay. Half to two-thirds of respondents agreed that merit pay would attract more highly qualified teachers (67%), increase teaching quality (66%), keep competent teachers in schools and incompetents out (58%) and improve student learning (55%). Greatest frequency of no opinion and no response (20%) was in response to the improvement of student learning.

One-fourth of respondents felt merit pay would undermine staff morale. Sixty two percent disagreed.

Agreement with identified criteria for merit pay ranged from 28% to 69%. Greatest agreement was expressed for student achievement (69%) and for teachers' completion of advanced study (61%). Roughly majority agreement was expressed for subject-matter knowledge (52%) and student evaluation of teaching (48%) as merit criteria. Over one-third of respondents agreed criteria should include parent (40%) and administrator (36%) evaluations. Twenty eight percent agreed to peer evaluation. Strongest disagreement was expressed for evaluation by peers (15%), administrators (12%) and parents (11%). Greatest ambiguity was expressed for administrators' evaluation (over 40% of respondents).

Eighty five percent or more of respondents recognized the importance of school board commitment, focus on student learning, staff involvement in planning, equal availability, definition of superior performance, objective assessment, workable administration and adequate funding in any merit pay plan.

The Image of Teachers. Two-thirds or more respondents would favor a son or daughter's becoming a teacher. However, 35% expressed no opinion or gave no response. Two-thirds felt that working conditions in schools are acceptable; 15% expressed no opinion or gave no response. Sixty percent felt they knew what was happening in schools although 80% saw need for more school collaboration with parents, community businesses and others.

Tax Support to Create Incentives

Community residents and businesses here also are given opportunity to express overall support for the kinds of specific incentives discussed above. In addition, survey respondents were given opportunity to express willingness to raise local taxes to support specific incentives (see Table 1).

Survey respondents expressed greatest support (more than 75%) for incentives to recruit exceptional teachers, establishing career ladders and expanding staff development. Least support (50-70%) was expressed for exceptions to state certification and school expenditures for public relations.

Table 1. Community Response and Support for Proposed Teacher Incentive Structures.

Should Maumee Schools:	Yes	No	NR
Establish a career ladder.	82.4%	8.5%	9.2%
Identify "master teachers."	78.2	14.1	7.7
Support teacher certification exceptions.	52.1	37.3	10.6
Recruit exceptional teacher candidates.	88.0	5.6	6.3
Expand staff development programs.	82.4	7.7	9.9
Adopt "merit pay" plans for teachers.	69.0	20.4	10.6
Include public/community relations activities in their budgets.	62.0	26.8	11.3
Increase Taxes to Support Same:			
Establish a career ladder.	56.3	24.6	19.0
Identify "master teachers."	51.4	29.6	19.0
Support teacher certification exceptions.	38.7	40.8	20.4
Recruit exceptional teacher candidates.	60.6	22.5	16.9
Expand staff development programs.	53.5	26.8	19.7
Adopt "merit pay" plans for teachers.	55.6	26.8	17.6
Include public/community relations activities in their budgets.	37.3	43.7	19.0

Conclusions

Overall community response to the survey's assertions about change in teacher recruitment, preparation and certification, career ladder and master teacher, school staff development, merit pay and teacher image was generally very positive. The positive response may be surprising, given the disproportionate number of survey respondents who were community residents without school-aged children. The overall positive response may also prompt particular attention to the few less positive individual responses.

Overall response seems most favorable with respect to teacher recruitment, career ladder and master teacher, staff development, and, perhaps, merit pay proposals. Overall response is least favorable with respect to teacher preparation and certification and teacher image proposals although there is a good deal of ambiguity in responses as well.

Community respondents were relatively hesitant to go along with changes in traditional teacher education and certification, perhaps a signal that, for all their apparent weaknesses, these institutional arrangements still enjoy public confidence. Respondents recognized need for greater financial support for, and greater selectivity in, teacher education. However, respondents seemed also to recognize the limitations of both money and selectivity alone.

Survey respondents clearly support differentiated recognition for teachers, especially based on excellence in teaching, student achievement and subject expertise. They were less enthusiastic about length of service or peer respect as criteria. Community respondents agreed that teachers need to be involved in curriculum development and preservice teacher education.

The community respondents supported a variety of staff development programs which are related to identified role responsibilities in a career ladder model. Respondents didn't seem to appreciate that staff development may be related directly to personal growth and development.

Perhaps surprisingly, respondents thought merit pay would have a variety of beneficial effects on teaching and learning in schools. More surprisingly, almost two-thirds apparently didn't believe merit pay would undermine staff morale. Community respondents agreed with the importance of all of the ingredients for an effective merit pay plan identified. However, least certainty was related to administrator and parent evaluations of teachers.

There also was a good bit of uncertainty in community response to the use of public relations in professional education. Community respondents identified need for greater school-community interaction, and they agreed that focus on school and student achievements would enhance the image of teachers. However, their responses evidenced reluctance for professionals' or schools' budgeting advertising. Perhaps the mix of responses itself suggests a need for more direct and more effective professional advertising.

References

Gallup, Alec M. "The 17th Annual Gallup Pole of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 67:35-47, September, 1985.

Task Force on Merit Pay and Career Ladders. Incentives for Excellence in America's Schools. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1985.

CHAPTER 11

EXCELLENCE IN THE PROFESSION OF TEACHING: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE PERFECT

Robert R. Dunwell
Washburn University of Topeka

Introduction

Each of the preceding chapters has described incentives for excellence in the profession of teaching--recruitment plans, career ladder plans, professional development plans, other incentive plans. But, is any one of these incentives, or any combination, likely to accomplish excellence in teaching? Is any one or any combination adequate to overcome the social, political, and economic forces which mitigate against excellence in the profession of teaching?

One of the difficulties confronting an appraisal is the scope of the problem which the different incentive plans attempt to address. A statewide career ladder plan, for example, must take into account a much broader range of variables than a local incentive plan. Establishment of a national certification board must be more comprehensive than a plan to improve certification requirements on the state level. Different factors are at work in rural Sunbelt schools than in schools in an industrialized megalopolis in the Northwest. However, whatever the difficulties, each of these plans seeks to provide teachers some kind of additional incentive to improve their performance.

By definition, a professional is a person who, as a result of extensive pre-service preparation, has become capable of making autonomous, accurate diagnoses of a complex set of factors adversely affecting a client, and, from an array of accepted techniques, has selected and applied an appropriate intervention to remedy or alleviate that condition. As important as the technical competence of the professional may be, no less critical are the abilities to appraise accurately and to act responsibly.

Enhancing professional excellence, then, is the process of improving existing circumstances in order to enable the practitioner to function more effectively and of reducing or eliminating those circumstances which prevent or inhibit more effective functioning. Hence, providing incentives for excellence in teaching requires not only helping teachers to become more skillful but, more importantly, helping them to become more autonomous and more responsible. Accepting this interpretation of what it is to be a professional provides the basis for our appraisal of present efforts and future prospects for professional excellence.

One of the major requirements for professional excellence is the development of a system of incentives sufficient to: (1) recruit those individuals who possess the potential to develop the full range of qualities required for professional practice, (2) retain an adequate number

of qualified practitioners to meet current and anticipated needs of the educational system, (3) develop a sense of responsibility for their own competency and its continuing improvement, and (4) inculcate a sense of collective responsibility for the improvement of the educational system and society.

Problems Confronting the Development of a Scheme of Incentives

From the point of view of the profession, teaching must acquire a surplus of the human energies it requires to prosper. To do this, it must convince enough people with enough potential abilities to become teachers. And, having attracted them to teaching, it must then keep them there and keep them productive. From the point of view of the individual, becoming a career teacher must be perceived as something worth doing, worth continuing to do, and worth doing well. Where teaching cannot offer everything to everybody, it has to offer enough somethings to enough somebodies. The right number of somebodies includes a lot of different individuals with a lot of different perspectives.

Developing the kind of incentive system essential to continuing excellence in teaching is not a simple task. It is not even a simple set of tasks. The inherent complexities become apparent when we consider the nature of the dynamic sets of variables involved and the dynamic relationships among these sets of variables, the agendas and arenas for excellence.

Fundamentally, each individual teacher becomes a strategic target. From within each person, we seek to elicit the efforts necessary to improved practice (Barnard, 1938). Each individual is incredibly complex. The psychological environment in which each individual functions is complex. The motives for functioning are complex. The factors which influence motives are complex (Bigge, 1982). A factor which may significantly influence an individual's motives at one time in one circumstance may have no effect whatsoever at a different time in a different circumstance. To add to the complexity of individual behavior, none of these elements is fixed. Most are only relatively stable; some are highly volatile. Barnard has stated that "the scheme of incentives is probably the most unstable of the elements" involved (Barnard, 1938, p. 85).

To make the situation even more overwhelming, individual behavior is greatly modified by the mere presence of other individuals (Schmuck and Schmuck, 1984), and the kind of behavior with which we are most concerned takes place only in the context of group interaction. When we seek to improve the performance of an individual teacher, we must do so in terms of all of the forces which influence that individual, particularly those which arise from his or her interactions with others. Excellence in teaching amounts to no less than improving the performance of the entire profession.

Lest we despair at the enormity of the problem before us, let us accept that we cannot possibly address all factors at once. Our approach simply is to identify a strategic factor, a factor which we can actually change, a factor which we believe will affect the overall balance between restraining and facilitating forces positively. We implement a change, observe what appears to be its effect, observe all other changes taking place simultaneously, identify a new strategic element, and attempt to alter it. Our approach is deliberately progressive. It is also usually much more gradual than we might wish. Our approach sometimes fails to compensate at all for changes among social, political, or economic forces over which we have no control whatsoever. Simply, we initiate the incentives for excellence in teaching one step at a time.

Recent Approaches to the Development of Incentives for Teachers

In part because of the urging of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), the American public and American educators appear to have arrived at some kind of agreement that the two most critical problems now facing teaching and their schools. These problems are: (1) the lack of teachers with quality educational backgrounds and (2) the lack of career incentives sufficient to retain the most talented teachers (English, 1984). In the great American political tradition of throwing simple solutions at complex problems, a majority of our state legislatures have, within the past two years, enacted education reform bills to mandate the development of performance-based incentive programs, e.g., merit pay or other career ladder programs.

The notion of differential salaries for teachers is not new. Differentials based on years of service and academic training are common. Differentials based *de facto* on the sex of the teacher have been eliminated but once were also common. Differentials based on grade level or subject matter specialities have been eliminated in favor of the single salary schedule, but they may be regaining popularity under the guise of "market sensitive" pay (English, 1984). Current incentive plans focus on: (1) differential pay based on quality of performance and (2) differential pay based on functional differences (Uzell, 1983; Barber and Klein, 1983; Dunwell, 1984; Lieberman, 1985).

What is different between earlier versions of merit pay and present career ladder models is that current versions of merit pay have become politically important at the highest state and national levels (Kapel *et al*, 1985).

Support for merit pay for teachers by the public and by various state legislatures is based, in part, on the mistaken belief that merit pay is widely used in business and industry, a belief that is not supported by accumulated evidence (Barber and Klein, 1983). The House Committee on Education and Labor (1983) describes the results of performance-based pay in the private sector as mixed and inconclusive and warns that those who view merit pay as an easy method of addressing the nation's education problems are not realistic (1983).

Advocates of various merit pay plans would also have us believe that teachers strongly support the concept of merit pay. The title of a recent article in The American School Board Journal proclaimed "Our Nationwide Poll: Most Teachers Endorse the Merit Pay Concept." Actually, the researcher upon whose work the article is based found that nearly two of three teachers that teachers who are more effective in the classroom should receive larger salary increases than teachers who are less effective (Rist, 1983).

Teacher Motivation and Merit Pay

Rebore (1981) poses a critical question for any pay system: Does money stimulate an employee's putting forth more effort? He concludes "that money definitely affects performance under certain circumstances (emphasis added). When minimum necessities have been satisfied, the motivational value given material incentives is extremely limited and almost entirely dependent on the creation of the attitude that individuals ought to want material things (Barnard, 1938).

Barnard also states that it is fallacious to believe that the attitude of employees toward management is governed primarily by economic motives. Hersey and Blanchard (1982, pp. 40-41) conclude that "money, the old reliable motivational tool, is not as almighty as it is supposed to be, (even) for production workers." And Frase et al, (1982) believe that the failure of merit pay has been the assumption that money is an effective motivator.

Maslow's classic motivation theory insists that we must take into account a great many other factors. The fulfillment of a need is dependent on the individual's perceptions and experiences. In fact, some individuals never feel that their basic needs have been fulfilled and remain at the bottom of the hierarchy among the group he calls needy persons. For any individual, the satisfaction of even basic needs is possible only when certain preconditions exist, including freedom, justice, orderliness, and challenge or stimulation. More significantly, the need hierarchy itself functions within the context of an environment that is only relatively stable (Maslow, 1970; Goble, 1970). Simply, individuals change, conditions change, needs change, the degree of need satisfaction changes, and motivators change.

However, money is also symbolic. It can represent almost anything an individual wants it to represent, and it can mean whatever people want it to mean (Rebore, 1981; Hersey and Blanchard, 1982). Hence, money has varying degrees of importance to individuals depending on their backgrounds and experiences (Rebore, 1982).

Factors Related to Teacher Motivation

If the crucial problems facing American education are the lack of teachers with quality educational backgrounds and the lack of career incentives sufficient to retain the most qualified teachers, then we must determine whether or not current efforts to implement agendas for recruitment, certification and induction, career ladders and merit pay,

school staff development and various nonsalary incentives are valid responses to these problems. To a large measure, a determination may be found in an analysis of why teachers enter teaching, what teachers find satisfying or dissatisfying about teaching, and why teachers leave teaching.

A 1983 study found that "the most frequently given reasons for entering the teaching profession were: (1) service, (2) working with students, (3) generally liking to work with people, (and) (4) participating in the development of children" (Bredeson, et al, 1983, p. 54).

Those teachers who said they had seriously considered leaving teaching cited salaries and working conditions as the biggest reasons. However, the possible actions they judged least helpful for improvement were performance pay and extra compensation for added responsibilities (Brandt, 1985, citing The 1985 Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher).

One of the problems with current incentive plans stems from what English (1984) calls the "myth of the unitary profession." Along with the general public and state legislatures, many persons tend to regard teachers as an homogeneous group, with similar likes and dislikes, influenced by the same satisfiers and dissatisfiers, affected in the same ways by the same set of extrinsic motivators.

A 1980 study of motivational differences among teachers and administrators reported: (1) a variation of psychological needs based on teaching level, age, and sex, (2) significant differences in security need deficiencies based on race, sex, and position and (3) differences in the fulfillment of desire for achievement, mastery, prestige, and recognition based on race (Chisolm, Washington and Thibodeaux, 1980). Wilkerson (1982) warns that the present merit system tends to confirm cultural bias rather than challenge it.

Hawley (1985) points out that teachers neither rank pay high as a source of motivation nor value upward mobility as much as they used to. And DeLamarter (1980) warns that external reinforcement, which merit pay may well represent, reduces the effect of any intrinsic motivation that is present.

A 1984 study found teacher burnout was related to need deficiencies in teacher motivation, especially "those higher level need deficiencies (self-actualization and esteem) which affect job satisfaction rather than lower level need deficiencies (autonomy and security) associated with job dissatisfaction" (Anderson and Iwanicki, 1984, p. 128).

Teachers themselves state that they think that the primary reason teachers are leaving the profession is because of low salaries (Gallup, 1984). But, "only a few former teachers identified money as an important factor in their personal decisions to leave, and several explicitly noted that money was not the reason" (Bredeson, Fruth, and Kasten, 1983, p. 56).

Teachers, former teachers, and administrators concurred that low salaries were a major dissatisfaction. In fact, low salary was subordinate to other issues such as geographic location, personal freedom in the job, and the nature of the job itself. And, when teachers responded to the question about whether they would once again choose to become teachers: (1) one-third gave answers related to students and curriculum, (2) another third cited issues related to personal growth, and (3) one-third talked about other personal issues such as time, security, and money (Bredeson, Fruth, and Kasten, 1983).

The most powerful motivational forces for teachers are a complex of intrinsic rewards including knowledge of student success, enhanced self-concept and self-esteem, and continued professional growth (Bredeson, Fruth, and Kasten, 1983).

Differences in Public and Professional Perceptions

What effect will incentives for excellence have on the teaching profession? Perhaps, no other issue has created stronger differences between the teaching profession and the public it serves, and to some extent, within the profession itself.

Gallup's 1984 survey of 2,000 teachers revealed that, although 76% of the sample felt there were teachers in their schools who were sufficiently outstanding to warrant merit pay, 64% were opposed to merit pay. Here, teachers differed significantly from the general public. Only 32% of teachers favored the idea of merit pay for teachers while 76% of the public did. The main reasons for teacher opposition were the difficulty of fair evaluation and morale problems among teachers (Gallup, 1984).

While educators argue the difficulty of implementing a differential incentive system, the general public suggests a direct solution. Since teaching is a relatively simple job, the evaluation of teaching must be relatively simple. Further, money will motivate highly qualified people to enter teaching and persuade them to stay in teaching (English et al., 1986). Although there is considerable agreement that the quality of teaching should be rewarded, controversy abounds over the fairness, validity, and reliability of current procedures to implement differential pay plans (Castetter, 1986).

Brinks (1983) asserts that a pay systems which don't incorporate merit pay deliberately ignore a major motivational tool, a feedback system based on acceptability of performance. Lieberman (1985) believes that merit pay has the potential to remedy the shortage of qualified persons entering teaching and the inability of teaching to retain qualified teachers.

French (1985) reports that the research on merit pay clearly shows that incentives must be substantial to have a positive impact and, even then, that merit pay does not create the desired effect if substituted for appropriate across-the-board salary increases. English (1984) concludes that "merit pay in the current national context is harmful.

Schneider (1983) has reported that the evidence on merit pay is inconclusive. Although the evidence against merit pay may not be conclusive, one would have to believe that evidence for merit pay also is not conclusive. The Carnegie Forum has recommended that "performance-based compensation systems should be regarded as developmental and teachers should participate actively in their design" (Carnegie, 1986, p. 96).

Sergiovanni (1985) has issued an even sterner warning. He believes that incentive systems inevitably lead to unnecessary competition, that rewards and punishments doled out by management inevitably result in increased vulnerability of teachers to external control rather than increasing internal discipline and self responsibility. This appears to have been true for salary schedules which paid teachers more for additional training. Teachers became interested in being paid more, not in improving their performance (Lieberman, 1985).

In summary, current approaches to incentive pay for teachers may decrease rather than increase excellence. Merit pay and career ladders may serve to destroy the values on which the teaching profession was founded. Other incentives for recruiting and developing excellent teachers may also be counter productive in some instances.

Promising Directions to Increase Excellence

A scheme of incentives will increase professional excellence if and when--and only if and when--each of the following four criteria is satisfied:

1. The scheme of incentives must be sufficient to satisfy the full range of variables present.

2. The scheme must be sufficient to achieve a favorable balance among satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

3. The scheme must be sufficient to achieve a favorable balance among alternate opportunities available.

4. The scheme must be sufficient to elicit a sense of responsibility for self and social improvement.

To help develop greater intrinsic satisfaction among individual teachers, we must redirect their efforts and their attitudes. The Carnegie Forum warns that "even if educators had strong incentives to improve performance and productivity, it is not clear that much would improve without major organizational changes" (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. 89). We will need to develop approaches to work with professionals from their first day in our pre-service preparation programs, even before, and throughout their professional careers. Incentives based on a consistent, comprehensive, continuous process of human resource development are more likely than others to enhance excellence.

Necessary elements of human resource development have been clearly identified (Solomon, 1977; Chisolm, Washington, and Thibodeaux, 1980; Owens, 1981; House Committee on Education and Labor). These include:

1. Performance appraisal interviews to share concerns, to develop an understanding of the difficulties the teacher is experiencing, and to identify the teacher's developmental needs. Underlying the notion of performance appraisal interviews is the conviction that a major role of the supervisor, if not the major role, is to develop the potentialities of the teacher, rather than to evaluate the teacher's performance. The external frame of reference and the use of so-called objective instruments are abandoned, at least in this instance, in favor of the internal frame of reference and the use of the techniques necessary to elicit perceptive self-reports from the teacher. The data collected are used, not to make decisions about the continuing employment of the individual, but to correct or alleviate conditions within the organization which have a negative effect on the performance and satisfaction of the teacher.

2. Feedback and performance coaching to help teachers become more effective and to provide guidance in improving performance capabilities. Having determined the nature of the organizational factors which inhibit teacher performance and having alleviated them, the next step is coaching the teacher to help her or him develop the skills and techniques that increase competence. Again, the individual teacher is an active participant in this process.

3. Long-range career plans for teachers to help them know the possibilities for their own growth and for enhancing long-range school planning. Becoming a competent building administrator, for example, requires a different and more complex (not necessarily more difficult or more important) set of skills than teaching. Becoming an increasingly competent teacher requires anticipation of the competencies and attitudes that will be needed to sustain the professional growth of the individual teacher over time.

4. Potential appraisal and development to identify the potential of the teacher to perform new roles and responsibilities In current practice, a teacher who wishes to become a counselor, a supervisor,

or an administrator bears much of the real and collateral costs of the advanced preparation program in order to enter a pool of similarly qualified persons waiting around for a vacancy to occur. Districts should invest the considerable resource they already possess in testing, counseling, and training students to identify and develop the potential of classroom teachers.

5. Training linked with performance appraisal and career development to enhance, update, or develop specific skills. No single program activity receives and deserves the unanimous disrespect of teachers than our current efforts at in-service education. Few districts have developed a systematic approach to the enhancement of teachers skills: auditing the untapped abilities of teachers that make up the school's variety pool, identifying the specific skills required to implement a new instructional program, auditing the skills required against the skills already possessed by each individual, conducting a systematic needs assessment to identify the weaknesses individual teachers themselves feel they need to acquire in order to improve instructional practice. Why a profession built on training uses it so badly with its own staff is indeed an enigma.

6. Human resources information stored in a central human resources data bank to identify employees for consideration for special projects, additional training, or higher-level jobs. The identification of the untapped skills and competencies held by our present teaching force has little meaning unless it is made a part of district planning. This requires the development of an appropriate means to store and retrieve this information in a usable form and the commitment to use it intelligently. Personnel administrators have come to recognize the real costs involved in the recruitment and acquisition of skilled personnel and the economic implications of employing, supervising, and ultimately having to dismiss poorly qualified personnel. Under-utilizing the abilities of professional teachers is simply another ineconomy the teaching profession cannot afford.

7. Organizational research and systems development assess the psychological health of the organization and various units within the organization to improve their functioning. The most striking characteristic of many organizations is their tolerance of unhealthy psychological working conditions

that have developed over time. Incidents of work-induced stress, including mental breakdowns, burn-out resignations, low morale are all ignored or rationalized as caused by personal "weaknesses." The question of teacher burn-out will not be addressed effectively until districts are willing to look at themselves honestly, to assess organizational morale systematically, to conduct exit interviews seriously, and then to do something about the causal factors they identify. The greatest waste of an organization's economy is found in the loss of the productivity of individuals who have been subjected to demotivating conditions the organization itself has created.

8. Rewards to teams, departments, and other units as well as to individuals for innovations and use of capabilities to encourage positive attitudes and skills. As an alternative to the creation of incentives to encourage the improvement of individual performance, districts should encourage schools to work together as schools, departments to work together as departments, grade level teams to work together as teams, and should offer appropriate rewards when these groups succeed. Such an approach would avoid the demotivation inherent in most competitive merit pay systems, and utilize the positive effects achieved through the development of a sense of mutual interdependence. The ability to work together effectively does not, however, emerge spontaneously; it must be deliberately created and nurtured as part of the organization's training program.

9. Employee welfare and quality of work life which focus on the environment within the organization. Few organizations recognize with more than lip-service their investment in the resources represented by their employees and their absolute dependence on these resources. Ignoring humanistic reasons, only for the sake of argument, fundamental economic reasons exist for the care and maintenance of an organization's human resources. No organization--industrial, military, or social--can long survive if it needlessly squanders the human resources it possesses. Teaching, as a social agency, has never enjoyed a surplus of economic resources; nor, will this level of support improve significantly in spite of the political oratory concerning the "crisis in our schools." Every effort must be made to attract, nurture, conserve, and increase the human resources presently represented by our teachers.

Only through a total commitment to human resource development can we truly provide incentive for the individual teacher to increase excellence in the profession and in our schools.

References

Anderson, Mary Beth G., and Edward F. Iwanicki. "teacher Motivation and It's Relationship to burnout," educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. XX, No. 2, Spring 1984.

A.S.C.D. Task Force on Merit Pay and Career Ladders. "Incentives for Excellence in America's Schools," National forum of Administration and Supervision, Vol. 2, No. 3, 1985/86.

Barber, Larry W., and Karen Klein. "Merit Pay and Teacher Evaluation," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 65, No. 4, December, 1983, 247-251.

Barnard, Chester I. The functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Bigge, Morris L. Learning Theories for Teachers. New York, NY: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1982. Fourth Edition.

Brandt, Ron. "Prerequisites to a More Rewarding Profession," Educational Leadership, Vol. 43, No. 3, November 1985.

Bredeson, Paul V., Fruth, Marvin J., and Kasten, Katherine L. "Organizational Incentives and Secondary School Teaching," The Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 16, No. 4, 1983.

Brinks, James T. "Is There Merit in Merit Increases?" in Klein (ed.), 1983.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, The Report of the Tas Force on Teaching as a Profession. New York, NY: The Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1986.

Castetter, William B. The Personnel Function in Educational Administration. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1986.

Chapman, David W., and Malcom A. Lowther. "Teacher's Satisfaction with Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 75, No. 4, March/April, 1982.

Chisolm, Grace B., Roosevelt Washington, and Mary Thibodeaux. Job Motivation and the Need Fulfillment Deficiencies. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980. ERIC Document No. ED 188 044.

Cornett, Lynn M. "Trends and Emerging Issues in Career Ladder Plans," Educational Leadership, Vol. 43, No. 3, November 1985.

DeLamarter, William A., and Krepps, Patrice E. Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Reinforcement: The Role of Task Interest. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, September 1980. ERIC Document No. ED 193 584.

Dunwell, Robert R. "Merit Pay: Issues, Not Answers," The Baylor Educator, Waco, TX: The College of Education, Baylor University, Winter 1984.

English, Fenwick. "Merit Pay: Reflections on Education's Lemon Tree," Educational Leadership, December 1983/January 1984, 72-79.

Frase, Larry T., Robert W. Hetzel, and Robert T. Grant. "Promoting Instructional Excellence Through a Teacher Reward System: Herzberg's Theory Applied," Planning and Changing. In Klein (ed.), 1983.

French, Russell L. "Dispelling the Myths About Tennessee's Career Ladder Program," Educational Leadership, Vol. 42, No. 4, December 1984/January 1985.

Gallup, Alec. "The Gallup Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public School," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 66, No. 2, October 1984.

Goble, Frank. The third Force. New York, NY: Grossman Publishers, Inc., 1970.

Hawley, Willis D. "Designing and Implementing Performance-Based Career Ladder Plans," Educational Leadership, Vol. 43, No. 3, November 1985.

Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982. Fourth Edition.

House Committee on Education and Labor. U.S. House of Representatives. Merit Pay Task Force Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

Kapel, David E., Stanley Mour, Betty Lou Whitford, Matt Benningfield, Terry Brooks, and Joseph Liedtke. "Linking Career Ladders with Demonstration Schools: A Proposed Cooperative Model," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXXVI, No. 3, May-June 1985.

Klein, Karen (Ed.) Merit Pay and Evaluation. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan, 1983.

Lieberman, Myron. "Educational Specialty Boards: A Way Out of the Merit Pay Morass?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 67, No. 2, October 1985.

Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality. New York, NY: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970. Second Edition.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk: An Imperative for Reform. Washington, DC: The Commission, April 1983.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981. Second Edition.

Pareek, Udai, "Developing Collaboration in Organizations," The 1981 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. La Jolla, CA: University Associates Inc., 1981.

Parish, John, "Excellence in Education: Tennessee's 'Master' Plan," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 64, No. 10, June 1983, 722-724.

Pate-Bain, Helen, "A Teacher's Point of View on the Tennessee Master Teacher Plan," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 64, No. 10, June 1983, 725-726.

Peterson, Ken, & Anthony Mitchell, "Teacher Controlled Evaluation in a Career Ladder Program." Educational Leadership, Vol. 43, No. 3, November 1985.

Rao, T. Venkateswara, "Integrated Human Resource Development Systems." The 1985 Annual Handbood for Group Facilitators. La Jolla, CA: University Associates Inc., 1985.

Rebore, Ronald W. Personnel Administration in Education: A Management Approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

Rist, M., "Our Nationwide Poll: Most Teachers Endorse the Merit Pay Concept," The American School Board Journal, Vol. 170, No. 9, 1983, 23-27.

Schneider, Frank, "Merit Pay for Teachers," in Klein (ed.), 1983.

Sergiovanni, Thomas. "Teacher Career Ladders: Myths and Realities in Implementation," Teacher Education & Practice. Vol. 2, No. 1, Spring, 1985.

Solomon, Lawrence N., "Team Development: A Training Approach," The 1977 Annual Handbood for Group Facilitators. La Jolla, CA: University Associates Inc., 1977.

State of Texas, The 1984 Legislature. House Bill 72. Austin, TX: 1984.

Uzell, Lawrence A., "Where Is the Merit in New Merit Pay Plans?" Education Week, Vol. III, No. 2, September 14, 1983.

Wagner, Laura A., "Ambiguities and Possibilities in California's Mentor Teacher Plan," Educational Leadership, Vol. 43, No. 3, November, 1985.

Wilkerson, Margaret B., "The Masks of Meritocracy and Egalitarianism," Educational Record, Vol. 63, No. 1, Winter, 1982.

The Project to Design Teacher Incentive Structures
TASK FORCE AND STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

David C. Abbott, Superintendent, Maumee City Schools (MCS), Maumee Ohio
Lee Black, Principal, Maumee High School, MCS
James J. Cellio, Biology Teacher, Maumee High School, MCS
Margaret Cowles, Sixth-Grade Teacher, Gateway Middle School, MCS
Donelda Criger, English Teacher, Maumee High School, MCS
Pamela Dickey, Graduate Assistant, The University of Toledo
Sr. Janet Doyle, O.P., Consultant, Catholic School Services, Diocese of Toledo
Elizabeth Ference, Third-Grade Teacher, Ft. Miami Elementary School, MCS
Richard C. Glowacki, Resident, Toledo, Ohio and President, State Board of Education
Marian Grems, Parent, St. Patrick of Heatherdowns School, Maumee, Ohio
James R. Gress, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education, The University of Toledo
James Haudan, Assistant to the Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Toledo
Mary Jo Henning, Professor and Chairman, Department of Curriculum and Educational Technology, The University of Toledo
Jennifer Hill, Home Economics Teacher, Maumee High School, MCS
Claire L. Jacobi, Administrative Assistant for Instruction, Maumee City Schools
James R. Johnson, Professor and Director, Off-Campus Education, College of Education and Allied Professions, The University of Toledo
Robert M. Kabat, Principal, Fairfield Elementary School, MCS
Mary Kasper, Principal, St. Patrick's of Heatherdowns School, Maumee, Ohio
Rita Kijowski, Fourth-Grade Teacher, St. Patrick's of Heatherdowns School, Maumee, Ohio
Gladys Krieger, First-Grade Teacher, Ft. Miami Elementary School, MCS
Patricia Kwiatkowski, Eighth-Grade Teacher, St. Joseph's School, Maumee, Ohio
Barbara Laird, Member, Board of Education, Maumee City Schools
William Lyons, Guidance Counselor, Maumee High School, MCS
Barbara McGowan, Vice-President, Bishop's Education Council, Diocese of Toledo
Ramona Mercer, Teacher, Gifted and Talented Program, Fairfield and Union Elementary Schools, MCS
Diane Ninke, Parent, Maumee, Ohio
Edward Osnowitz, Associate Principal, Maumee High School, MCS
Donald C. Powell, Dean, College of Business Administration, The University of Toledo
David Roshong, Sixth-Grade Teacher, Gateway Middle School, MCS
Philip J. Rusche, Dean, College of Education and Allied Professions, The University of Toledo
Carol Russel, Parent, Maumee, Ohio
John A. Spiess, Professor and Chairman, Department of Educational Leadership, The University of Toledo
Murray Stahl, Resident and Advertising Executive, Maumee, Ohio
Mary Ann Steinbaugh, Seventh-Grade Teacher, St. Joseph's School, Maumee, Ohio
Lorraine Sweigard, Supervisor, Special Education, Maumee City Schools, MCS
Rev. Fr. John A. Thomas, Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Toledo
Serena Troyan, Science Teacher, Gateway Middle School, MCS
Vicki Wertzbaugher, President, Maumee Parent-Teacher Association, MCS
Jane Williams, Fifth-Grade Teacher, St. Patrick's of Heatherdowns School, Maumee, Ohio
Dennis E. Wroblewski, Attorney, Maumee, Ohio
Sr. Mary Ellen Youngblood, O.P., Consultant, Catholic School Services, Diocese of Toledo